

The Consequences of Mobility

Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones

Preisler, Bent; Fabricius, Anne H.; Haberland, Hartmut; Kjærbeck, Susanne; Risager, Karen

Publication date:
2005

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Preisler, B., Fabricius, A. H., Haberland, H., Kjærbeck, S., & Risager, K. (Eds.) (2005). *The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Institut for Sprog og Kultur.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF MOBILITY

Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones



The Tower of Babel

Edited by
**Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjaerbeck, Karen
Risager**

The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones

Edited by: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjaerbeck and Karen Risager

Layout and Web presentation: Erik Swiatek

Copyright 2005.

Published by the Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde University, Denmark, 2005.
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0

Disclaimer

Liability: For documents and software available from this server, Roskilde University does not warrant or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed.

External Links: Some Web pages to which we provide links may contain links to other Internet sites for the convenience of users. Roskilde University is not responsible for the availability or contents of these external sites, nor does Roskilde University endorse, warrant, or guarantee the products, services, or information described or offered at these other Internet sites. Users cannot assume that the external sites will abide by the same Privacy Policy to which Roskilde University adheres.

Pop-Up Advertisements: When visiting our Web site, your Web browser may produce pop-up advertisements. These advertisements were most likely produced by other Web sites you visited or by third party software installed on your computer. Roskilde University does not endorse or recommend products or services for which pop-up advertisements appear on your computer screen while you are visiting our site.

CV of editors

Bent Preisler, Professor of English Language and Sociolinguistics at Roskilde University. MA in English Linguistics, and Dr.Phil. in Sociolinguistics, from Aarhus University. One-time Visiting Professor at State University of New York (Binghamton) and Visiting Scholar at University of California (Santa Barbara). Author or co-author of works on English grammar, phonology, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, language pedagogy, and English as a foreign and international language, e.g. (as author) *Linguistic Sex Roles in Conversation* (Mouton 1986) and a book in Danish on the use of English in Denmark.



Anne Fabricius, Associate Professor in English language at Roskilde University. Degrees in Linguistics from the University of Queensland and the Australian National University. Ph.D. in Sociolinguistics from Copenhagen Business School. Has published articles on sociophonetic variation in English Worldwide and Language Variation and Change. Research interests include phonetics, sociolinguistic theory and methodology, and subjective factors in sociolinguistic variation and change. She has recently published work on a project dealing with sociolinguistic attitudes towards Received Pronunciation and regional British accents.



Hartmut Haberland, Associate Professor (Reader) in German and General Linguistics at Roskilde University. Degree in Linguistics and Philosophy from Freie Universität, Berlin. Co-founder (in 1977) of the *Journal of Pragmatics*, of which he remains a co-editor. He has also taught in Berlin, Düsseldorf, Copenhagen and Athens, and was a one-time guest at Beijing University of Foreign Studies and at Dokkyo University (Soka, Japan). Main research interests: sociolinguistics, pragmatics, linguistic aspects of human-machine interaction and history of linguistics. Recent publications include articles on language policy issues.



Susanne Kjørbeck, Associate Professor in Danish Language and Public Relations at Roskilde University. Degree in Spanish from Aarhus University. Ph.D. in Danish and Mexican discourse structure from Odense University. Research interests: conversation analysis, storytelling, focus group interaction, reception studies, organizational communication, intercultural communication. SK has recently co-authored a book on international business negotiation in Spain and published an article on empowerment and disempowerment in social-worker/client talk.



Karen Risager, Professor of Cultural Encounters at Roskilde University. MA in Linguistics and French from Copenhagen University. Dr.Phil. in Language and Culture Pedagogy from Roskilde University. Director of the Cultural Encounters Programme. Research interests: sociolinguistics, language and culture, cultural dimensions of foreign and second language teaching and learning, internationalisation and intercultural pedagogy. Co-author of *Language Teachers, Politics and Cultures* (Multilingual Matters, 1999). Her doctoral thesis on the relationship between language and culture was published in Danish in 2003, and is scheduled to be published as two separate books by Multilingual Matters (to appear).



The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones

Introduction

i

PART I: Construction of sociocultural identities in face-to-face interaction¹

1. Marta Gonzalez-Lloret:
Reconstructing NS/NNS communication
University of Hawaii (USA) 1
2. Eric Hauser:
Footing and identity in interaction at a conversation club
The University of Electro-Communications (Tokyo, Japan) 28
3. Susanne Kjaerbeck:
Narratives in talk-in-interaction: Organization and construction of cultural identities
Roskilde University (Denmark) 45
4. Paul McIlvenny & Pirkko Raudaskoski:
Figuring the transnational 'child-to-be-adopted': The web as a virtual sociocultural contact
zone for intercountry adoption
Aalborg University (Denmark) 58
5. Alexandra Münch / Doris Stolberg:
"Zwei languages *zusammenputten*": Bilingual ways of expressing bicultural identities
University of Mannheim (Germany) 71
6. Yuko Taniguchi:
Affect and EFL classroom: Language contact in addressing
University of Limerick (Ireland) 80

PART II: Surveying sociolinguistic contact zones: Behavioural and attitudinal consequences

7. Jaine Beswick:
The Portuguese diaspora in Jersey
University of Southampton (UK) 93
8. Matt Ciscel:
Language and identity in post-Soviet Moldova
Central Connecticut State University (USA) 106
9. Anne Fabricius:
Mobility, contact and an accent norm: The case of Received Pronunciation
Roskilde University (Denmark) 120

10. Stephanie Hughes:
Bilingualism in North-East France with specific reference to Rhenish Franconian spoken by Moselle cross-border (or frontier) workers
University of Antwerp (Belgium) 135

PART III: Mobility and the complexities of language and culture teaching and learning

11. Virginie André and Desirée Castillo:
The 'Competent Foreigner': A new model for foreign language didactics?
Université Nancy 2 (France) 154
12. Maud Ciekanski:
Towards the development of a plurilingual and pluricultural competence
Université Nancy 2 (France) 163
13. Ulla Lundgren:
Intercultural understanding in teaching and learning English: An opportunity for Swedish compulsory education.
School of Education and Communication (Sweden) 171
14. Karen Risager:
Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching.
Roskilde University (Denmark) 185
15. Miriam Schildkraut:
Linguistic socialization and social identity: Arab students in a mixed college in Israel
Kaye College of Education (Israel) 197

PART IV: Languages in contact: internationalization and national language policy

16. Annjo K. Greenall:
To translate or not to translate: Attitudes to English loanwords in Norwegian
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Trondheim, Norway) 212
17. Hartmut Haberland:
Domains and domain loss
Roskilde University (Denmark) 227
18. Bent Preisler:
Deconstructing 'the domain of science' as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies: The relationship between English and Danish in higher education and research
Roskilde University (Denmark) 238

19. Dag F. Simonsen:
Over the fence – and into English? Reflections on adolescents, academics, linguistic
development and language policy in Norway in the early 2000s
The Norwegian Language Council (Norway) 249

Epilogue

- 20 Petra Daryai-Hansen:
Promoting linguistic diversity: Reflections on the language policy of European language
policy conferences
Roskilde University (Denmark) 272

The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
i-vii
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© the Editors, 2005

The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones

This anthology is the result of an international conference held at Roskilde University, Denmark, on May 23-24, 2003. The aim of the conference was to investigate the different kinds of linguistic and sociocultural contacts brought about by transnational migrations and social mobility in the contemporary world. The theoretical and methodological focus was on various forms of integration between on the one hand sociolinguistics, the sociology of language and language policy, and on the other hand the general area of cultural studies: studies of cultural and social identities, of multiculturalism, cultural hybridity and identity politics in complex societies.

The papers read at the conference attested to a widespread interest in this field, and offered an impressive range of topics related to language and culture contacts from all over the world. Languages included in studies of language contact and bilingualism were Albanian, Arab, Catalan, Danish, English, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Norwegian, Portuguese, Rhenish Franconian, Romanian/Moldovan, Spanish, and Swedish. Researchers represented universities in Belgium, Britain, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, France, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Oman, Norway, Singapore, Sweden and the US.

Almost all the papers presented at the conference, and a few others that have been kindly offered to us later, are included in this anthology. We are happy to invite readers to share with us the many insights and perspectives contained in the articles.

The book is divided into four parts that correspond to four different workshops at the conference:

Part I. Construction of sociocultural identities in face-to-face interaction

Part II. Surveying sociolinguistic contact zones: behavioural and attitudinal consequences

Part III. Mobility and the complexities of language and culture teaching and learning

Part IV. Languages in contact: internationalization and national language policy

Part I deals with construction of identities in intercultural face-to-face talk and written texts on the Internet. The contributors use an inductive approach, on the basis of audio- or video-recorded data which have been transcribed in detail. The method is to a large extent ethnomethodological conversation analysis, but discourse analysis and sociolinguistic methodology are also applied in some of the articles. The contributors have in common their focus on members' actions, practices and competence, just as they share an interest in understanding what happens in different sociocultural con-

tact zones where peoples' mobility has resulted in intercultural encounters – whether in Spain, Japan, the US or on the Internet.

Marta Gonzalez-Lloret focuses on miscommunication or non-understanding between native speakers and non-native speakers. The data consists mainly of audiotaped recordings of service encounters in Spain, and the approach is conversation analysis. The study considers the type of misunderstanding or non-understanding which occurs, how the repair process is initiated, how it is carried through, and how the communication is re-established after the repair. The author points to the necessity of incorporating the process of co-construction in the language training of non-native speakers, in order to help them be socially competent interactors.

Eric Hauser's chapter takes as its point of departure Goffman's concepts of *footing* and *production format*, and by means of a conversation analysis approach he analyzes interactions between native and non-native speakers of English in a conversation club at a language school in Japan. The author shows how the production format of talk provides a resource for the local constitution of cultural identities and of native versus non-native speakers.

Susanne Kjærbeck focuses on narratives in intercultural focus group interaction, especially on organizational features and on the construction of cultural identities. Through conversation analysis she shows that the narratives function as argumentational units which support a proposed opinion or moral, and which are suggestive of the generalizability of the activities told, thereby implying cultural categories. Identities and alignment between the participants are negotiated with linguistic and extra-linguistic communicative resources at the micro level of talk.

Paul McIlvenny and Pirkko Raudakoski analyze web texts concerned with intercountry adoption and the discursive construction of the 'child-to-be-adopted'. In particular, they look into the role – from the parents' point of view – of the 'intimate public sphere' of the Internet, by investigating personal web pages and online diaries anticipating the transnational mobility of a child awaiting adoption. They show how this 'child-to-be' is figured and categorised. The authors use a discourse studies approach that integrates conversation analysis and discourse analysis, examining how the social issues and discourses of adoption are mediated in the actions and practices of different agents, primarily the adoptive parents.

Alexandra Münch and Doris Stolberg look into bilingual ways of expressing bicultural identities. Their research focuses on contact phenomena between German and English, and their data represents interaction among first generation German immigrants to the USA. They show that one participant keeps her two languages strictly separate, thereby separating her American and German identities, whereas another participant uses intense language mixing, creating an integrated German-American identity. On the basis of their analysis they conclude that individuals of comparable linguistic background and competence show diverging bilingual language use.

Part II presents four papers that are united methodologically in their survey-based approach to behavioural and attitudinal issues within various contact zones, and in their concern to reveal changing and stable patterns. Secondly, they show the persistence of similar issues through different levels of scale as we move constantly inwards from, firstly, the level of national self-determination (Ciscel), through the transnational context (Hughes), and the diasporic minority community (Beswick), to, finally, the social class (Fabricius). In summary, then, Part II takes up the challenge of

examining sociolinguistic contact zones and viewing the consequences of mobility on different scales by means of surveys and questionnaires which illuminate the particularities of the situations.

In a paper on language and identity in post-Soviet Moldova, Matthew Ciscel investigates the crisis in linguistic identity affecting the multilingual Republic of Moldova as contact zone between Moldovan, Romanian and Russian. About two-thirds of Moldovans speak a dialect of Romanian that has been subject to a high degree of politicization in recent history. Moldova is presently ruled by a democratically-elected, revived Communist party that propagates older Soviet policies of russification and Moldovan distinctiveness. However, the pro-Romanian opposition which arose during the decade following 1989 has gained the status of a valid alternative. In addition, although many still argue that Russian should be a second official language (because 'everyone' speaks it, as the ideology maintains), 'Moldovan' is still the only official language in the country's Constitution. The study focusses on the ongoing contentious arguments over Moldovan linguistic identity, and exemplifies this by presenting language use data from a survey of 124 students and young professionals, as well as an ethnographic report of a single speaker's expressed views in an English language class. The data demonstrate the general ambivalence of the new generation toward ethnically based national identities and the persistence of a multi-ethnic Moldovan national identity. The politicization of language throughout Moldova's recent history means that the country remains a fiercely negotiated linguistic contact zone, with language the most problematic element of national identity.

Stephanie Hughes' paper examines the phenomena of bilingualism in the contact zone of the Moselle area of North-East France on the border with the Saarland, where cross-border workers negotiate linguistic identity in the context of interaction with German and French. The study presents an extensive historical background and takes up an empirical investigation of this little-known corner of France, in a survey of language use amongst 120 cross-border workers, conducted in 1998. The consequences of mobility in this case are that the respondents do not find themselves in a stable diglossic situation, but rather in a situation of linguistic flux. There are several micro- and macro-level factors which mitigate against use of Rhenish Franconian dialect in daily life, with the result that dialect is not being spoken to the same extent as it was in the past. There has been a significant decline in the number of native speakers and a progressive erosion of the dialect's underpinning in the community. Hence, this location presents many cultural, social and economic repercussions to be explored. By reporting on the usage of, and attitudes to, the dialect spoken by cross-border workers, Hughes gives a baseline to which future studies may refer in order to track ongoing developments in cross-border workers' use of the Rhenish-Franconian variety within this border region between France and Germany.

In her paper on the Portuguese diaspora in Jersey, Jaine Beswick explores one example of the type of linguistic and sociocultural contact zones found between diasporic and host communities. Her study examines the case of students studying English in England, whose families migrated from Portuguese Madeira to the Channel Islands during the twentieth century. She presents results of an in-depth study of five students' responses to discussions and interviews designed to reveal the complexities of their linguistic and cultural identities, shaped as they are by ongoing personal history and the ethnic, cultural and social background of their formative years. Her research provides insights into contextual language use, mediated by students' personal observations regarding sociolinguistic networks and ethnic identity. Her results focus on hierarchical and attitudinal factors which play a role in determining daily, interpersonal communication strategies. In her conclusions, Beswick reports that the Portuguese language is being maintained in the Jersey community as an emblematic reinforcing and unifying symbol of group identity, at the same time as the respondents

sometimes undermine and undervalue their ability in Portuguese and resort to code-mixing. This duality, and the issue of language preference in general, proved to be most illuminating for issues of identity in the diasporic contact zone.

The final paper in this section, by Anne Fabricius – on mobility, contact and accent norms – focusses on the British accent norm, Received Pronunciation, hereafter RP. The first part of the paper sets the stage for a renewed sociolinguistic view of RP, and examines some of the consequences of present social and geographical mobility and contact on the sociolinguistic status of the accent within England. It also takes up the challenge of incorporating developments in sociological theory which centre on new understandings of the concept of social class. Class is one of the facets of sociolinguistics which has been neglected in the past, but remains crucial to an understanding of RP as a class accent in England. Contra claims that class has lost its relevance (see e.g. Coupland, Sarangi and Candlin 2001), this paper argues for the continuing relevance of a restructured and updated notion of individually-instantiated social class for the discussion of an elite social class accent in Britain. The second part of this paper looks at examples which illustrate the changing situation of RP in present-day England. Social mobility is presently changing the ‘place’ of RP within England. This is illustrated with interview and questionnaire data showing phonetic changes in progress and overt and covert attitudes to RP in a contact zone with other British accents.

Part III, on mobility and the complexities of language and culture teaching and learning, focuses on foreign and second language teaching. This is a field which is currently questioning its traditional aim of developing learners’ proficiency and competence in the target language and associated culture(s). Theories of language learning and teaching can no longer ignore the complexities of modern multilingual and multicultural societies marked by transnational processes. The theory and practice of foreign and second language teaching has to give up the monolingual bias, including the still dominant focus on the native speaker as the only legitimate norm of language learning. Language teaching is a linguistic and sociocultural contact zone where several languages may come into contact: the learner’s first language, other languages already known, and the new target language to be learnt – none of these languages being an invariable and stable entity, existing rather as linguistic practices that are forever developing in social networks of many kinds. How can one develop the theory and practice of language teaching and learning under these changing circumstances? How can foreign and second language socialization and identity formation be viewed? What is communicative and intercultural competence today? The articles in Part III point to a range of important perspectives on these issues.

Karen Risager deals with the identity of language studies with special reference to the relationship between language and culture. She looks at language studies in a sociolinguistic perspective focusing on the spread of languages in social networks all over the world by way of migration and other transnational processes. Language teaching is thus seen as a local contact zone where two or more linguistic networks meet and interact in and among the learners and their teacher(s). She also raises the question of how one can theorise the relationship between language and culture within such a dynamic sociolinguistic view of languages, and she proposes to exploit the concept of languaculture, i.e. the varied cultural dimensions of each language, including the personal, idiolectal part developed (constructed) by the individual learner as a mix of his/her first language and other languages learnt.

Maud Ciekanski reports from a language course (in Nancy in 2001) where a group of administrative workers at the university, who all have French as their first language, attended an integrated course

in English and Spanish as foreign languages. The learners were beginners and volunteered in the experimental course. They were also interviewed before and after the course on their expectations and experiences concerning languages in contact in the learning situation. The aim of the course was to develop the learners' plurilingual and pluricultural competence, including their metalinguistic awareness of similarities between languages and of positive aspects of code-switching in the learning process. Thus it is an example of research and development related to the concept of plurilingualism (and pluriculturalism) as an integrated resource in the individual.

Virginie André and Desirée Castillo's point of departure is a critique of the prevalent model of the native speaker as a norm for foreign and second language learning. They are especially interested in intercultural communication in service encounters, and refer to concepts like 'communicative virtues' og 'ethos' as important aspects of intercultural competence. The preferred model for foreign language learning is described as the 'competent foreigner', who maintains his/her cultural identity while developing intercultural sensitivity, incl. an awareness of the methodology of ethnography: observing, participating, experimenting and knowing. The language teacher is seen as an adviser who helps the learner develop his/her communicative and intercultural competence in an independent way.

Miriam Schildkraut focuses on the importance of the sociocultural and political context of learning. She describes a project conducted in a teacher training college in Israel (in 2001-2002). The project developed two different frameworks for the learning of Hebrew by Arab students. Both frameworks contained group discussions in workshop form, but one framework was organised as a mixed Hebrew as L1 and Hebrew L2 workshop focusing on topics like co-existence, whereas the other was organised as a homogeneous Hebrew as L2 workshop focusing on topics related to democracy and minority rights. Error analysis of Hebrew L2 learner language in the two frameworks shows that the real dialogue in the mixed groups greatly enhanced language learning, especially as regards style and lexis.

Ulla Lundgren deals with the different discourses on the teaching as English as a Foreign Language in Sweden. She is especially interested in different conceptions of 'intercultural understanding', one of the aims of language learning in Swedish schools. The three discourses chosen for analysis are: research discourse (international theoretical discourse on the teaching and learning of culture as a dimension of language teaching and learning); authority discourse (official guidelines for the teaching of English in Sweden); and teacher discourse (on the cultural dimension of language teaching, investigated in an interview study). In the article Ulla Lundgren focuses mostly on teachers' perceptions of culture, knowledge and the conditions for developing intercultural understanding.

Part IV, the last section of this book, is about nations as multilingual contact zones, and the consequences of languages coming into contact across national borders, which often involve issues of relevance to national language policy. Before the dawn of Information Technology, this aspect of internationalization was primarily a function of *physical* mobility and contact, of people moving from one country to another. This phenomenon is still as common as ever in most parts of the world, but Information Technology has brought about a new kind of mobility, 'virtual mobility' (cf. Greenall, below) where ordinary people are enabled, through television, computers, CDs and other electronic media, to visit any number of foreign lands – to experience their cultures and communicate with their inhabitants – without having to leave their own living room, let alone crossing any borders. Both physical and virtual mobility involve changes in attitudes and communication patterns, requiring accommodation to new identities and languages.

The articles in this, final, section are all concerned primarily with the influence of a language which, par excellence, owes its world-wide success to 'virtual' mobility, i.e. the English language: The influence of English on indigenous languages and language use, in countries where English is a foreign language, is not generally the result of migration, just as linguistic accommodation to the English language is not always motivated by a need for a common code, being often symbolic of cultural values that are admired and with which the speaker wishes to identify. In any case, linguistic identities are seen to be fluid and multidimensional, never absolute or consistent, which is attested to by each of the remaining contributions. One important consequence of this seems to be that the concept of 'domain loss' – the idea of indigenous languages losing 'domains' to English – may be a more problematic one than is generally assumed, a theme taken up by several of the authors (Simonsen, Haberland, Preisler).

Annjo K. Greenall, investigating attitudes to English loanwords in Norwegian, focuses on the fact that – as a consequence of 'virtual mobility' – a large number of English loanwords have recently made their way into Norwegian texts. The Norwegian Language Council (NLC) has displayed a largely negative attitude to this development, recommending that English words and expressions be translated into Norwegian. However, as the NLC, though highly influential, has no legislative power, their recommendations are not always accepted by the Norwegians. An interesting window to popular response has been opened in the form of *Ordlabben* (the Word Lab), an Internet discussion list put up by the NLC in collaboration with a tabloid newspaper. Here people are invited to suggest translations for recent English loanwords. The majority of respondents delve headlong into this task. However, a minority cry out in deeply felt frustration, being often adherents of subcultures in Norway that are defined by English terms, for whom a replacement of these terms would entail, in effect, a loss of culture. Greenall argues that if a Bakhtinian view of language and culture is adopted, it will be more difficult to reject the latter respondents' chosen option (i.e. non-translation). 'Borrowing' words from English does not have to be seen as passive acceptance of an imperialist move. From the earliest occasion of its use, the source culture word or expression enters into an active dialogue with its new users within the new culture, a dialogue which changes it for ever, imprinting on it thoughts and values inherent in the target culture. The word ceases to be the sole property of the source culture, taking on a new life as an integrated element of the target language, in a natural process of dialogical evolution.

Dag F. Simonsen reflects on the use of English by particular groups, and its consequences, in Norway in the early 2000s, discussing the domain loss theory according to which English may displace Scandinavian languages in crucial sectors of society. Simonsen proposes a model which links the advance of English to people's free choices, and which is based upon three conditions: (1) bilingualism in the national language and English, (2) arenas where real choices are possible and (3) motives for preferring English. This model is applied to youth language and academic language in Norway, on the basis of recent research. Both groups' competence in English has improved, and there has been an increase in the number of arenas and motives for using English. As for the adolescents, though they ascribe strongly positive symbolic value to English, there are few indications that they are dropping Norwegian, whereas academics tend to use English more, both in publishing and other discipline-related activities. The author reflects upon the consequences that should be drawn in relation to language policy: Youth marks a period of freedom, and as the language use of Norwegian adolescents does not seem to forebode a general transition into English, it should be stimulated rather than limited. On the other hand, academic language use is already governed by regulations

and could be further regulated, if necessary by law, so as to promote parallel use of Norwegian and English at the universities.

Hartmut Haberland examines the very concepts of ‘domains and domain loss’, in his contribution thus entitled. The domain concept, originally suggested by Schmidt-Rohr in the 1930s (as credited in Fishman’s writings in the 1970s), was an attempt to sort out different areas of language use, in multilingual societies, which are relevant to language choice. In Fishman’s version, domains were considered as theoretical constructs that can explain language choice, and which were supposed to be a more powerful explanatory tool than more obvious (and observable) parameters like topic, place (setting) and interlocutor. In the meantime, at least in Scandinavia, the term ‘domain’ has been taken up in the debate among politicians and in the media, especially in the discussion whether some languages undergo ‘domain loss’ vis-à-vis powerful international languages like English. An objection that has been raised here is that domains, as originally conceived, are parameters of language choice and not properties of languages, hence languages do not ‘have’ domains, and therefore cannot lose them. Another objection is concerned with the applicability of the domain concept to actual patterns of language choice in multilingual settings. Especially Pádraig Ó Riagáin has claimed that at least some multilingual situations are best *not* described in terms of domains. Haberland also discusses some recent research into e.g. the multilingual communities of the Danish-German border area, which seems to confirm this.

Finally, the domain concept undergoes critical scrutiny in a discussion of a particular ‘case,’ as Bent Preisler deconstructs ‘the domain of science’ as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies, exploring the relationship between English and Danish in higher education and research. Preisler introduces the Danish debate concerning the influence of English on Danish language and language use, and – drawing on previous research – describes what he sees as the two main ‘sides’ in the debate: (1) the ‘followers,’ i.e. the vast majority of the population whose attitude to English is simply instrumental, and who embrace the influence of English as a manifestation of internationalization; (2) ‘the concerned,’ a small but influential minority whose views on the influence of English are more critical, and who represent the cultural elite. He then takes a quick detour into postmodernism, deconstructing the concepts of ‘Language’ and ‘Domain,’ and redefining the latter as ‘practice’ in an ethnographic sense. Taking a closer look at the relationship between English and Danish within one particular ‘domain,’ the ‘domain of science,’ where English is often thought to have won out, he shows that this is really *two* domains (i.e. practices): the domain of university *research*, and the domain of university *teaching*. Only in the domain of university teaching does it make sense to talk about a potential ‘domain loss’ for Danish, whereas Preisler concludes that, within the domain of university research, English and Danish are functionally distributed, and that this does not in itself affect the status of Danish within Danish society.

The volume concludes in a thought-provoking ‘epilogue’ by Petra Daryai-Hansen, who comments on the paradox of conferences on linguistic and sociocultural diversity being conducted in English ...

Marta Gonzalez-Lloret: Reconstructing NS/NNS communication
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
1-27
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Marta Gonzalez-Lloret and the Editors, 2005

Reconstructing NS/NNS communication

Marta Gonzalez-Lloret

Spanish Division, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI, USA
marta@hawaii.edu

Abstract

The study of miscommunication between native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) is a recent one, derived mainly from the literature on miscommunication between native speakers, borrowing its terminology and paradigms. Most of the studies focus mainly either on the source of miscommunication or trouble source, or on how the repair process begins, that is who initiates the repair (either the speaker -self-repair initiation- or the listener -other-initiated repair). This study considers two other important steps in a case of miscommunication: the negotiation/repair and the re-establishment of communication. That is, who collaborates in the repair of the miscommunication and how the interaction is reconstructed. A better understanding of the reinstatement process is an essential step for Second Language Learning since sociolinguistic interaction is a vital part of communication. This paper presents eight interactions. Seven of them service encounters, between NS and NNS from a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, focusing on what type of misunderstanding or non-understanding occurs, who initiates the repair and how, who actually repairs the miscommunication and how, and how participants continue constructing the interaction after it is repaired.

“Much learning does not teach understanding”
Heraclitus (540BC-480BC)

Introduction

The study of language interaction between NSs and NNSs focusing on acquisition¹ has been done from several main perspectives: from an SLA perspective, a Discursive theory of SLA, and a social perspective. In the SLA paradigm, studies of interaction between NNSs have looked at the negotiation of meaning that is necessary in order to maintain a conversation, the “collaborative work which speakers undertake to achieve mutual understanding” (Ellis, 1994, p. 260). Most of the studies in the SLA field have focused on how the interlocutors reestablish the conversation after a break using techniques such as clarification requests, corrections, comprehension checks, recasting, and paraphrasing, and negotiation has been found to be central for SLA (Long, 1996; Pica, 1994 for overview; Varonis & Gass, 1985). Second perspective, Discourse Theory has focused on the interaction as the vehicle to learn to communicate. The learner engages in conversation in order to

¹ There is a great body of research of the interaction between native and non-native speakers that does not focus on the interaction component, such as studies of bilingual interaction, code switching, cross-cultural pragmatics, and intercultural misunderstanding.

learn how to 'do' conversation (Hatch, 1978; Schwartz, 1980). A third perspective considers interaction as a social practice shared by a group, in which a learner needs to acquire the ability to construct, reconstruct, and orient to the "structuring resources of the interacting" (Hall 1993, Ochs, 1991).

Most studies have looked at miscommunication in interaction from different points of view: from a linguistic point of view (Gass and Varonis, 1991; Pica, 1994; White, 1989), from a sociological point of view (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1990), from an intercultural point of view (see Banks et al., 1991 for overview; Hinnenkamp, 1987), from a pragmatic point of view (Gumperz, 1978; Hansell & Ajitutu, 1982; Trosborg, 1987), and from a more eclectic view (Bremer et al., 1996; Coupland et al., 1991). Many of the studies on interaction have taken as their main subject of study the repairs of miscommunication, since they are the main realization of the miscommunication itself. Nevertheless, not many studies have looked at miscommunication as the premises for building an interaction, moving away from the negative perspective of the phenomenon to a more positive constructivist idea (Bremer et al., 1996; Drummond & Hopper, 1991; Koole & Thijs, 2001; Ochs, 1991).

This paper takes communication breakdown as an integral part of interacting and learning to communicate in a foreign language, focusing mainly on reconstructing interaction as a form of second language acquisition. This approach has implications for the field of foreign language learning and teaching, since the teaching of "communication repair" is largely ignored in language classrooms and teaching materials.

What's in a name

One of the main difficulties for a good understanding of the subject is the difference in terminology that is used across fields and authors to identify the same phenomenon, and the use of the same term for different phenomena. When talking about some problem on the communication flow of an interaction, we find terms such as 'miscommunication' (Gumperz & Tannen, 1979; Milroy, 1984), 'misunderstanding' (Gumperz & Tannen, 1979; White, 1989), 'non-understanding' (Bremer et al., 1996), 'communication break-off' (Gass & Varonis, 1991), 'Communication mix-up' (Tannen, 1975), 'communicative breakdown', and 'trouble' (Hinnenkamp, 1987).

Not only do the lexical terms present problems, miscommunication has been approached from different perspectives of communication with important conceptual divergence. See for example House, Kasper, and Ross (2003) introduction and illustration of different approaches in chapters. In this paper, 'negotiation' will be understood in Wagner's (1996) term, as co-constructed by the participants in each interaction.

Some authors have differentiated between 'non-understandings' (when the listener realizes s/he cannot make sense of what s/he hears either because of linguistic constraints or because the frame of reference in which they need to be understood is not clear), and 'misunderstandings' (when the listener achieves an interpretation which makes sense to her/him, but it was not what the speaker meant) Bremer et al., (1996). Nevertheless, these categories are not absolute, and from the researcher's point of view it is many times difficult to know how much of the utterance the listener has actually understood by looking at the interaction only. Since this paper uses a CA approach that looks at the interaction, and not to the participants' heads, this paper will not consider such a distinction.

Miscommunication

In any type of interaction, miscommunication can exist due to different social backgrounds, perspectives, etc. In an interaction between NSs and NNSs the possibilities of miscommunication rapidly multiply. This is due to the fact that interlocutors don't share the same language, the same sociocultural rules of discourse, or a shared linguistic, cultural and personal background (Gass & Varonis, 1991; Gumperz & Tannen, 1979; Hinnenkamp, 1987). Nevertheless, the participants in an interaction will do anything they can to repair the miscommunication and continue the interaction. This is especially true in service exchanges such as selling/buying, since both parts have high interest at stake. The buyer wants some type of merchandise or service, while the seller wants the transaction to be successful for economic gain. If the flow of the communication is somehow interrupted, both parts have interests in resolving the situation. In this case the participants most likely will not let important breaks of meaning pass by, unless the break is irreparable, in which case one of the parties will miss their purpose on the interaction, and the interaction will come to an end.

A recent TV commercial for a checking bank-card illustrates this point. Yao Ming, a famous NBA Chinese basketball player, is in a shop in New York. He approaches the counter to pay for a statue of liberty souvenir. The shop assistant is a young girl, in her 20s. Two other employees are there as well as two other young customers (in their 20s). At the end Yogi Berra, a famous baseball player, approaches the counter. VOV corresponds to the voice over of the announcer.

1. Yao: can I write a check?
2. Girl: yo. (.) (pointing at sign behind the counter that says "absolutely no checks"))
3. Yao: ↑yao (.)
4. Girl: ↓yo::
5. Yao: ↓Yao ((pointing at his name on his jacket))
6. Girl: ((making a sign with hand to another employer)) ↑yo
7. Emp1: yo. ((nodding of head))
8. Yao: can I wrote a check?
9. Emp1: ↑yo:: ((pointing at sign))
10. Yao: ↑yao:: =
11. Emp1: =yo::: ((pointing at sign))
12. Guy1: ((grabbing friends arm and pointing at Yao)) yo,
13. Yao: ((to the young guys)) Yao
14. Guy1: [YO:::
15. Guy2: [YO:::
16. Yao: ((to both guys)) YAO
17. Emp2: ((to Yao)) <yo>,
18. Yao: can I write a check?
19. Emp2: ((tapping on the sign)) <yo.>
20. Yao: [hhhh ((leaving the statue of liberty on the counter and leaving))
21. VOV: <[next time use your ((name of card)) instead of cash it'll get you in out and on with life>
(Yao leaves the store and Yogi Berra enters)
22. Girl: ((point out at sign)) yo.
23. YB: gi ((with check book in hand to purchase a gigantic baseball ball))
24. Girl: ((shrugging her shoulders))
25. YB: yo(.)gi
26. Girl: ((sight)) ↑yo: ((calling the other employer with a hand movement))
(transcription by researcher from Visa commercial, aired at Super Bowl 2003)

This example shows an irreparable communication break, which leaves the NNS, Yao, frustrated, and the shop assistant with a sensation of failure (in line 26 she sighs when confronted with the

same conversational situation again). This is actually quite a comical example, but for a NNS learning a language it can be a traumatic experience that would influence her/his motivation for learning the language.

This paper looks at miscommunication between NS/NNS from a co-construction of interaction framework, considering not only linguistic intervening factors but social factors too. A social perspective on language acquisition considers not only the language improvement, but also the process by which learners become culturally competent members of a language community. A constructivist theory defends that participants learn by “constructing” their knowledge, it implies that each member of the interaction brings her/his own expertise, skills and backgrounds to carry the interaction and solve any problems (Wenger, 1998). In an interaction between NNS/NS, the NS is the expert member of the language community at the ‘center’ of the community, while the NNS is new and ‘peripheral’, but still participating (Lave & Wenger, 1991). It is through the interaction that the NS will eventually move towards the center of the language community, becoming more linguistically and socially competent. This idea of social participation for cognitive development can be traced back to Vygotsky’s idea of an essential link between social transmission and cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1986).

The purpose of this paper is not the study of the miscommunication process per se, but the way in which NS and NNS interact to rebuild the flow of communication, and how the communication continues after the order is re-established, a point that has never, to my knowledge, being studied before. In order to study the repairs and continuation of communication, we need to look at the miscommunications, why the interaction flow breaks, how the participants try to repair it, many times unsuccessfully, and how the communication is re-established.

Types of miscommunication

Although some authors have proposed that language is not an important factor in miscommunication, stating that ‘purely linguistic competence in terms of command of the language spoken cannot be held responsible for communication trouble’ (Hinnenkamp, 1991, cited in Bremer, 1997, pg. 37), the interaction between NS/NNS is largely affected by the language command of the NNS. For this reason, this paper looks at several types of misunderstandings, both grammatical and sociocultural. From this perspective, Gass & Varonis, (1991) presents miscommunication as both a grammatical and sociocultural phenomenon. For them (as well as Milroy, 1984), miscommunication occurs when there is a mismatch between the speaker’s intention and the hearer’s interpretation. As subcategories of miscommunication, they distinguish *misunderstanding* which implies different semantic analysis by the speaker and hearer (Bremer et al., 1996; House, Kasper, & Ross, 2003), and *incomplete understanding* in which one or both of the participants recognize that there is a problem in the communication. This concept is what Bremer et al. term ‘non-understanding,’ although for Bremer et al. it is the listener that realizes that the communication is not being effective.

At this point, when the participants in the interaction try to solve the problem that has risen, *negotiated communication* occurs, which may result on the solving of the miscommunication or in a total lack of understanding. *Grammatical miscommunication* includes the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and prosodic systems of the languages. Gass and Varonis (1991) present an interesting case in which two Filipino nurses, with L1 Tagalog, were accused of murder, by injecting patients with a drug, based on circumstantial evidence and the nurses’ discrepancies in testimony. A close analysis of the grammatical differences between Tagalog and English show the

difference in verb aspect and tense marking. The example shows the difficulties in the language that the nurses encountered during the interrogation.

1. Q: So are you saying that some time during that time you learned about Pavulon?
 2. A: Yes
 3. Q: And what else did you learn about Pavulon, other than it was given at surgery?
 - 4. A: Are you asking me about what I know about Pavulon in the summer of '75 or what I know about Pavulon at the present time, after hearing all these experts?
 5. Q: What you knew about Pavulon at that time.
 - 6. A: I know a little about Pavulon
 7. Q: What did you know about it?
 - 8. A: I know it is used in anesthesia.
 9. Q: Why? Or, what else do you know about it?
 - 10. A: When I work in ICU, I learn that it's used to patient to relax. It's a muscle relaxant. The patient should be on respirator and it should be ordered by a doctor.
- (from Naylor, 1979, pp. 5106-5107, transcripts; cited in Gass and Varonis, 1991)

Even in a transcription lacking important prosodic information, and probably phonetic accuracy in the defendant's use of language, we can see in line 4 the confusion of the defendant about the tense of the verb employed by the lawyer. This is understandable considering that Tagalog is a language which marks the verbs for a rich system of aspect such as beginning and end of action, but not of tense, which is not marked in the verb. Therefore, for the Filipino nurse 'know' and 'knew' are only distinguishable by the action being terminated, 'knew' would mean 'knew but not any more', more like the English 'had known', 'know' on the other hand means 'still in progress'. After her question on line 4 and the lawyers recast of the past form in line 5, she still does not take on the past form of the verb (line 6), and continues to use the present tense for what it should have been the past tense (line 6, 8 and 10). This is also probably due to the fact that it is not a salient form in this dialogue, since most of the times it is in a question form, in which the past is then marked by the modal 'did' and not the verb itself. All the changes in verb tenses lead the jury to think that her testimony was full of inaccuracies. This is without doubt a tragic example of grammatical miscommunication, and it shows how important linguistic expertise in a court cases can be. *Sociocultural miscommunication* occurs when [the] "NS tends to attribute NNS a knowledge of sociolinguistic rules of interaction based on a demonstration of familiarity with the purely linguistic rules". This type of communication is common when the NNS is highly proficient. An example from Tannen (1975) illustrates this type of miscommunication.

- | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| NS (wife): | Bob's having a party. Wanna go? |
| NNS (husband): | OK |
| NS: | (later) Are you sure you want to go? |
| NNS: | OK, let's not go. I'm tired anyway. |
- (From Tannen, 1975, cited in Gass & Varonis, 1991, pg. 131)

In this example the wife, in line 3, uses a direct tone with her husband to not impose the invitation on him, but he interprets it as an indirect way of communicating that she doesn't want to go, and he answers negatively in order to please her, contradicting his first answer and creating a confusing situation for his wife. This situation may not only rise between Ns and proficient NNS but also between NNSs.

When describing misunderstandings we need to consider *what* was not understood and *why* it was not understood, we can usually not talk about one single cause of non-understanding, but a group of factors with more or less impact (Bremer, 1996). It is also important to consider these questions from both a linguistic and a social point of view.

Types of repair-initiations

According to Hinnenkamp (1987), repair does not equal error correction. A repair guarantees the normal flow of conduct and order in the interaction (Goffman, 1971). Following Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977) a ‘repair’ is a “practice for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation (and in other forms of talk-in-interaction, for that matter)” (Schegloff, 2000, pg 207). For them an integral part of repairs is its organization, who initiates the repair and when. They propose that repairs can be initiated by the speaker of the problematic source or ‘trouble source’ (TS), ‘self-initiated repair’ or the listener ‘other-initiated repair’. Although in their 1977 paper, Schegloff et al. claimed that other-initiated repair usually follows the TS in the next turn (‘next turn repair initiations’ or ‘NTRs’), following research by Wong (2000) which showed that repairs in data between NS and NNS did not always occur in the next turn position. We need to take these results with caution, though, since we don’t know to what extent these results apply to other NNS than the Chinese-English speakers in the corpus. More recently, Schegloff (2000) investigated more native speaker data and modified his framework to include cases in which the repair does not occur in such a position. For this paper, I would incorporate Schegloff’s (2000) terminology for the analysis of repairs. In addition, I will use the terms ‘Repair Success’ (RS) to evaluate the ‘repair-initiation’ attempts. Tzanne (2000), presents a list of the possible repair-initiation strategies, although she refers to them as ‘repair attempts’. She presents three groups: the first group includes direct repair-attempts, the second group repairs by hinting, and the third group points out the possibility of avoidance. See Figure 1.

Direct repair-attempt

- [1] Speaker rebukes hearer in offensive manner
- [2] Speaker starts RA by referring to hearer’s inability to understand
- [3] Speaker corrects in form ‘Not X, Y’ or ‘No, Y.’
- [4] Speaker corrects in form ‘Y.’ (*repetition, reformulation of TS, rephrasing*)
- [5] Speaker corrects as in [4] and elaborates
- [6] Speaker starts RA by accepting responsibility for misunderstanding

Repair by hinting

- [7] Speaker leaves RA unfinished before correction
- [8] Speaker invites hearer nonverbally to reconsider interpretation
- [9] Speaker offers corrections in indirect way

Repair-attempt avoidance

- [10] Speaker replaces repair-attempt with apologies
- [11] Speaker avoids addressing the misunderstanding

Figure 1. Repair attempt strategies (Tzanne 2000:200, text in italics added).

In addition to these strategies, this paper will consider ‘clarification requests’ and ‘confirmation checks’ [12] as a type of other repair-initiation, since it is produced in a moment in the interaction when non-understanding is present.² Examining these moments of communicative difficulty acts as a ‘magnifying glass’ for analyzing how both parts come to some type of understanding (Bremer et al., 1996).

² Some researchers (Hosada, 2000), don’t consider request for confirmation as addressing a type of misunderstanding because they don’t really address “problems” in the communication.

Another consideration when looking at the location in which the repair-initiation starts is the idea that the longer the distance between the repair initiation opportunity and the repair-initiation the harder it is to re-establish the communication (Drummond and Hopper, 1991; Hinnenkamp, 2003). Their examples of telephone conversations (between NSs) show that when the repair is initiated by the same speaker (self-initiated repair) it is usually done in the same turn, before the interlocutor speaks, this does not require any type of intervention from the interlocutor, since there is not a real break of communication or need of negotiation. When the problem is pointed out by the hearer (other-initiated repair) right after the TS, it is usually done in the form of a clarification request, confirmation request, restatement with a change of prosody, etc. If the distance is larger than the fourth turn, the clarification needs to be more specific, usually with reference to the TS, and frequently takes to 'stacked repairs'. For a framework that categorizes miscommunications considering the repair that usually follows see Hinnenkamp (2003).

Co-constructing the interaction

Vasseur et al. (1996) propose that although the difficulty of the discourse is an important factor in building an interaction, "it is the attitude and discourse behaviour which often makes the difference.", "the interactions are, we reiterate, jointly constructed." (pg, 92-93). They present the same speaker in different situations and how sometimes she comes out of the interactions frustrated and without having accomplished her goal while other times she manages to carry on a satisfactory exchange. There is a main difference between Vasseur's study and this study in that their study involved minority groups of NNSs from a perspective of relations of power and gatekeeping encounters, while the participants in this study were not in a socially marked position, other than that of being tourists. All except one of the interactions presented here are service interactions, in which the distribution of power is more even. Both client and seller have a stake in the interaction. It is important for the client to be successful to acquire a product and for the seller in order to make a sell and possibly make a client. In spite of social and linguistic differences, buying and selling exchanges are based on some common knowledge of the world. This is an everyday type of exchange with common patterns of interaction, which can probably be followed by the participants, given their common knowledge. It seems that this activity is an optimal setting for the construction of a common "discursive intercultural" (Koole & Thijs, 2001).

As part of the collaborative process of communication, when the NS realizes that s/he is talking to a NNS with low command of the language, s/he usually modifies her/his language, this is known as 'foreign talk'. As part of this modification, the NS may make use of different language strategies, such as language simplification, topicalization of salient elements, repetition, and emphasis (Hinnenkamp 1987; Roberts, 1996). The NS may also revert to previous knowledge of a similar interaction (Bremer & Simonot, 1996) and/or other non-verbal strategies such as body language. This study looks at the data and analyzes if the NSs in each case are using such strategies when communicating with the NNS, and how these contribute to the co-construction of the interaction.

Research questions

To summarize, the main research question this study tries to answer is: How do NS and NNS re-construct service interactions when there is a non-understanding or misunderstanding?

In order to answer this question, four steps during the interaction need to be considered and four questions answered: Q1: How do misunderstandings occur (the type of misunderstanding); Q2: Who attempts to repair the miscommunication and how do they initiate the repair (the type of repair

initiation); Q3: Who repairs the misunderstanding and how is it done (the repair process); and Q4: What happens after the misunderstanding is repaired (the re-building of the interaction).

Method

The data for this study are based on seven conversations between native speakers of Spanish and native speakers of English, learners of Spanish. Six are service exchanges, while one is a private conversation. The L2 Spanish participants were between the ages of 22 and 28 and were part of a study abroad program in Spain. The students can be classified as intermediate students although their conversational abilities are different. The female student has taken more than six Spanish courses at an American University and she is working towards a degree in Spanish. This was her first experience at a Spanish speaking country. The male student has only taken one class but has visited the country regularly to visit family and friends. Although miscommunication can be due to negative stereotypical views of groups (Hewstone & Giles, 1986; cited in Bank et al., 1991), this was not considered one of the possible reasons in these data because both students involved in the interactions did not look like “typical” American students, and their L1 accent when speaking L2 was not easily identifiable.

The conversations varied between 2 minutes and 18 minutes. All the conversations were recorded with a small digital recorder. The students carried the recorder with them and were asked to record their service encounters during several days. The NSs were not aware they were being recorded. Transcription and conventions were adapted from the work of Ten Have (1999). (Translation by the author).

Conversational Analysis

The analysis of the data was done using a Conversational Analysis (CA) approach. There is a growing number of studies in the field of NS/NNS interaction that use a CA approach (see Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Boden, & Zimmerman, 1991; Wong, 2000), and especially of conversation interactions that are not “casual” conversation but have a purpose and/or are embedded in institutions or daily practices (Firth, 1996).

Conversational Analysis (CA) was adopted for the examination of the data because a detailed analysis of the order of the data helped to find the sources of “trouble”. CA brings to the analysis the notion of ‘intersubjectivity’, how participants in social interaction use resources to achieve understanding and show comprehension of it. The detailed analysis of CA allows to look at the verbal and non-verbal communication used by the participants to make sense of each other and show involvement in the conversation (Roberts, 1996). CA reveals when the participants themselves refer to a problem of communication, which is something imperative for the analysis itself (Wagner, 1996). It also allows to focus on the turns of the interaction which helps to see the non-understanding process. (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Bremer et al., 1996). As Schegloff (1984 cited in Bremer et al. 1996) points out understanding and non-understanding are shown through the ‘responsive treatment’ of the ‘prior turns’ talk’. An added advantage of using CA for this research is that in CA, the analyst is able to make observations in the data in her/his quality of “co-membership” of the participants’ linguistic-cultural community. It is this shared knowledge that allows the analyst to use her/his intuition and recognize “describable” ways of doing things. (Jefferson & Schenkein, 1978, Sacks, 1992, both cited in Firth, 1997). In the case of this research, I shared linguistic and cultural knowledge of all participants involved, since Spanish is my native culture and language, and I have native-like command of the participants L1 language and culture.

One of the pitfalls that have been attributed to CA is that most analysts make distinctions between main and side-sequences, sometimes paying less attention to the second one. Nevertheless, since in interactions between NNS/NS side-sequences tend to be of great importance, portraying the “struggle and pressure” to reach understanding and becoming the focal point of study (Roberts, 1996, pg. 31), in this paper, such side sequences will not be differentiated from the main sequences.

Data analysis and results

In this section I will present seven data cases. Each case starts with the full interaction followed by its analysis according to the four elements discussed in the Research Questions section.

Case 1. Next turn repair. The perfect co-structor.

Joe and Fin, both NNS of Spanish, L1 English, go to a shop to develop Advantix film. They need the photos developed soon because they leave for another city at the end of the week. The Shop attendant is a young female Spanish speaker.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|------|--|
| TS | 1. | Joe- | hola tenemos una película de advantix y es posible:: (.) devlove;;r
'hola we have an advantix film and is it possible to (.) retur::' |
| SR | 2. | NS- | revelarlo!
'develope it' |
| AK | 3. | Joe- | revelar:-
'develop:-' |
| | 4. | NS- | una semana
'a week' |
| | 5. | Joe- | una semana (.) y cuanto cuesta?
'a week (.) and how much does it cost?' |
| | 6. | NS- | depende del tamaño que halláis hecho
'depends on the size you have made' |
| | 7. | Joe- | ok (..) y (..) (hands in the role) |
| | 8. | NS- | son veinticinco (.) pero depe[nde del tamaño,
'they are 25 (.) but it depends on the size' |
| | 9. | Joe- | [sí entiendo ok.
['yes I understand ok' |
| | 10. | NS- | si es así, así o así (.) panorámica ((using hand motion))
'if it is like this, or like this, or like this (.) panoramic' |
| TS | 11. | Joe- | es mixto=
'it's mixed' |
| RS | 12. | NS- | =mezclado
'mixed' |
| AK | 13. | Joe- | si so:: |
| | 14. | NS- | pues no sé (.) más o menos (6s) ponemos diez, diez y cinco? diez normales diez de grupo |
| | 15. | | y cinco panorámicas? más o menos?
'dont know (.) more o less (6s) should we say ten, ten and five? Ten normal, ten group and five panoramic? more or less?' |
| | 16. | Joe- | mas o menos
'more or less'
(2.5) ((NS is calculating in a calculator)) |
| | 17. | NS- | unas <u>mil</u> setecientas <u>pesetas</u>
'about 1700 pesetas' |
| | 18. | Joe- | ok y ah (.) |
| | 19. | NN2- | cuanto eh euros?
'how much eh euros?' |
| | 20. | NS- | euros? (she goes to a different counter) |

		'euros?'
		(6s)
	21. Fin-	() cause ()
	22. Joe-	yea, because we are leaving on friday
	23. Fin	[yea ya we are living xxx
		(13 s)
	24. NS-	son <u>diez</u> euros
		'its' ten euros'
	25. Joe-	vale y ah (.) no es posible mas rápido? (.) [porque::
		'ok and ah(.) is it not possible faster? (.) [because:::]'
TS	26. NS-	[podemos pon[er urgente pero::: esataría: (.)
	27.	<a principios de la semana que viene>
		[we could write urgent but::: it would be (.)
		<at the beginning of next week>
	28. Joe-	ok,
	29. NS-	sobre el miércoles o jueves de la semana que viene.
		'around Wednesday or Thursday next week'
	30. Joe-	ok,
	31. Joe-	either Wednesday or Thursday
	32. Fin-	()
	33. Joe-	porque uhm vamos a barcelona en viernes (.) y (.) necesitamos=
		'cause uhm we are going to barcelona on friday and we need'
	34. NS-	=las fotos
	35. Joe-	Sí (.) antes
		'yes before'
	36. Joe-	so:: ok wednesday or thursday
	37. Fin-	wednesday is a holiday
TS	38. Joe-	ah, sí (.) wednsday es un fiesta
		'ah yes (.) Wednesday is a holiday'
SR	39. NS-	no, la semana que viene!
		'no, next week'
AK	40. Joe-	ohh el próximo semana!
		'oh next(masc) week(fem)'
	41. NS-	eso es
		'That's right'
	42. Joe-	ah no (.) ok (.) so no es más rápido?
		'ah no (.) ok (.) so it's not faster?'
	43. NS-	no porque va a barcelona
		'no because it goes to barcelona'
	44. Joe-	ya! (.) este verd- este viernes (.) a barcelona
		'ya! (.) it's verd- this friday (.) to barcelona'
	45. NS-	mmm no!
	46. Joe-	no?
	47. Fin-	XXX
	48. Joe-	[mmkey
	49. Fin-	XXXX
	50. Joe-	mm right! muchas gracias (gigglingng softly)
		'thank you very much'
	51. NS-	de nada, a vosotros!
		'you're welcome, (thank) to you'

TST- Trouble source , M- Misunderstanding , ORI- Other- Repair Initiation, RS- Repair Success, AK- Acknowledge, NVSR- Non-verbal successful repair.

This example shows how smooth an interaction can be when the trouble sources are repaired immediately (next turn repair) (Drummond and Hopper,1991; Schegloff, 1977). In this case we have an extremely cooperative NS, who offers immediate help when the NNS interlocutor starts to show any sign of trouble. The trouble sources never become miscommunication problems, because

the NS resolves them right away. When Joe cannot find the Spanish word for ‘develop’ (line 1), she facilitates it before he can even finish his incorrect guess (line 2). She even clarifies the word *tamaño* (‘size’) (line 8) with hand gestures, in line 10, although there was a claim to comprehension, as expressed by Joe in line 9 (*si entiendo* ‘yes I understand’). Similarly, in line 11, what could have been a potential problem for the communication, a wrong lexical choice, was immediately corrected in line 12 and the correction acknowledged by Joe in line 13. The sequence of lines 38-40 is a little different in the sense that the trouble source is not a lexical problem but a content problem. Joe thinks Wednesday is a holiday and the shop assistant corrects him (line 39) in the next turn. Joe acknowledges the correction, regarding the content as expressed by his intonation and exclamation ‘ohh’, however, he does not pick up on the grammatical form used by the attendant. He uses the article and the adjective on the masculine form although they need to agree with the feminine sustantive *semana* (‘week’). This may be evidence that the NNS is actually focusing on the content and not the linguistic component of the interaction.

In this example the shop assistant plays an important part in the co-construction of the interaction. She is aware of Joe’s language constraints, and although her speed does not slow down, and she does not modify the language structure or use code-switching, she gives support when Joe finds it difficult to finish his utterances. She is practicing what Bremer & Simonot (1996) term ‘taking up an incomplete contribution’. This is the ideal co-constructor since she not only offers help with points of difficulty, but she also ‘gives room’ (Bremer & Simonot, 1996) for the NNS to contribute to the interaction. She even advances answers to questions that would have logically been asked in the interaction without waiting for the NNS to formulate the question. In line 4 she answers *una semana* (‘one week’), since the next logical question in the interaction would have been ‘how long does it take?’. We will see that although the NS in all the data cases are very friendly and participatory, not all interactions were so smooth, requiring more effort by both parts.

Case 2. Pañuelos. A stack of misunderstandings

This case is an example of several linguistic misunderstandings that tried to be resolved by the NNS and the NS without success, the misunderstandings are ‘stacked’ until the first misunderstanding is finally resolved. This interaction is a very illustrative example of both NS and NNS collaborating to co-construct a dialogue, at times very difficult.

Joe and his friend enter a small shop to buy a handkerchief for Joe's friend, all the merchandise is behind the counter. A Spanish woman, about 60, helps them behind the counter. Joe is a NNS male L1 English mid 30s; Frd is his friend, a 60 year old woman L1 English; LDY is the shop lady about 60, L1 Spanish.

	1.	Joe-	hola, buenas [tardes ‘hello, good [evening’
	2.	Ldy-	[buenas tardes [‘good evening’
	3.	Joe	lo siento mi español es un poco malo ‘I’m sorry but my Spanish is a little bad’
	4.	Ldy	ah bueno, va[le= ‘ok, it’s ok’
	5.	Joe	[pero [‘but’
	6.	Ldy	=yo te entiendo, a ver ‘I understand you, let’s see’
TS	7.	Joe	ah okey (.) la mujer eh quiere eh servilletas ‘ah ok (.) the woman eh wants eh napkins’
ORI	8.	Ldy	mantel,

AK/ M1	9.	Joe	'tablecloth', mantel. sí 'tablecloth. yes'
	10.	Ldy	de que tamaño? 'what size?'
	11.	Joe	i:↑ ah
ORI1	12.	Ldy	este? ((showing box with a tablecloth)) 'This one?'
	13.	Joe	diferente tipos or? 'different types or?'
M2	14.	Ldy	i+ aquel le gusta? xxxx 'yes↑ you like that one?'
			((she leaves the counter and comes back with a box))
	15.	Joe	no sí ok xxx ((talking to his friend))
	16.	frd	xxxx is mantel?
	17.	Joe	xxx not mantel, hold on
	18.	frd	handkerchief? (0.8)
	19.	Ldy	pequeño o mas grande? 'small or bigger?'
			((showing a tablecloth))
SRI2	20.	Joe	oh [no no ah (.)]
	21.	frd	[no no ((laughs))
	22.	Joe	no para mesa↑ pero para cara. 'no for table↑ but for face'
	23.	Ldy	ahhhhh
	24.	Joe	tiene? 'do you have?'
	25.	Ldy	servilletas sueltas? °esque eso no es° (.) esto 'individual napkins? that really it is not (.) this'
ORI2	26.	Joe	no, no es ah (0.4)
	27.	Ldy	ah! toalla ya se 'ah! towel I know'
AK/TS	28.	Joe	toalla. okey. 'towel, ok.'
M3	29.	Ldy	°a ver de esos de papel? ° 'lets see those paper ones'
			((pointing at a box))
OIR3	30.	Frn	no papel, no papel 'no paper, no paper'
SR	31.	Ldy	() de aquellas ((reaching towards bathing towels)) '() those there'
SIR	32.	Joe	no es toalla para cuerpo 'it's not towel for body'
OIR	33.	Frn	no,
SR	34.	Joe	es para nariz 'is for nose'
AK	35.	Ldy	ahh!=
	36.	Joe	=sí? =
SR	37.	Ldy	=pañuelo ((laughing)) 'handkerchief'
AK	38.	Joe	((laughing)) pañuelo okey 'handkerchief, ok'
	39.	Frn	((soft laughter))
	40.	Joe	sí.
			((brings boxes with handkerchiefs))
	41.	Frn	o:ke:y::
	42.	Joe	this?
	43.	Ldy	bordadito a mano, muy barato eh 'hand embroidered, very cheap'

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| 44. | Joe | °one euro° ((looking at the tag)) |
| 45. | frn | one euro |
| 46. | Joe | amarillo (.) y (.) blanco (.3) that's one hundred pesetas (.4) you like this?
'yellow (.) and (.) white' |
| 47. | frn | mmhmm. ((nodding)) |

The interaction starts with Joe introducing himself as a NNS (line 3, 'I am sorry my Spanish is very bad'), that the shop lady acknowledges (line 6), inviting Joe to continue the interaction 'let's see'. In line 7, the first problem arises when Joe asks for *servilletas* ('napkins') and it won't be resolved until line 37, at the end of the interaction, when they all realize that the lexical term he used does not correspond to the item they are looking for (handkerchiefs). Since the lexical term used by Joe is a legitimate item to be purchased in this shop, the misunderstanding takes to a new misunderstanding to a new misunderstanding, and so on, all of them from the trouble source *servilleta* ('napkin'). In line 8, trying to repair the trouble source, the lady proposes a lexical correction to 'napkin', 'tablecloth' since usually napkins are not sold individually (other initiated repair). Joe then acknowledges the correction, in an assertive intonation, creating a new misunderstanding (since they are not looking for a tablecloth). When in line 10 she tries to find information about the size of the tablecloth and Joe is unable to understand, she offers a visual aid, and shows a tablecloth in a box. Joe again creates a new misunderstanding when he asks for 'different types' (line 13) (implying 'something different') what the NS understands as different types of the same element (tablecloth). In the embedded dialogue between Joe and his friend in English (lines 15-18) they start realizing that maybe *mantel* means 'tablecloth' and he himself initiates the repair in line 20, followed by a repair initiated by other, his friend (line 21). The repair includes laughing and several assertive 'no', followed by a statement about the use of the item 'not for the table but for the face'. This new piece of information far from clarifying the misunderstanding, takes it back to the association with the incorrect lexical item *servilleta* ('napkin'). In line 25 the NS still does not know what they want and does not offer an alternative, Joe does not offer an alternative either, but rather a long pause. This is usually a common point of breakage of the interaction or interaction foreclosure. Nevertheless, in line 27 it is the NS who offers another possibility, rebuilding the interaction. She offers *toalla* ('towel') as a possibility, probably associated to Joe's assertive comment in line 22 'for the face'. Joe takes up the lexical item (line 28) and his intonation reveals that this could be the item he is looking for. This misunderstanding is revealed when she offers the word *papel* ('paper') a word Joe's friend knows well (line 30) rapidly volunteering a repair to the misunderstanding, which is successfully repaired in line 31 when the lady reaches towards bathing towels. Although the embedded misunderstanding about being 'paper' has been resolved, the misunderstanding about looking for a 'towel' has not. Both Joe (self-initiated) and his friend (other-initiated) try to repair and finally, in line 34, Joe initiates the repair that will lead to a successful repair in line 37 'handkerchief'. The tension of the interaction is released through the laughter of all participants, the breakdown has been repaired and the interaction continues now as a regular sell/buy encounter. The lady brings out a box of handkerchiefs, Frd chooses several and they pay for them without any more trouble.

This is an interesting example of co-construction which involves hard work from both participants. Both backchannel the other's utterances, and acknowledge when improvement has been done in resolving part of the trouble. The NNS acknowledges the NS's suggestions in line 7, line 9, and line 28 both with an uptake of the lexical item. There is even one instance in which the shop lady acknowledges she is understanding Joe, although the understanding is not real, she still does not know what they actually want: in line 23, her exclamation 'ahhhh' and intonation seemed to indicate she has the answer, but two lines later she is still wandering what he wants ('individual

napkins? that is really not this'). The NNS tries his best to find lexical items to repair the miscommunication and the NS offers opportunities for the NNS to explain himself at the same time that offers support when he lacks the language competence.

Case 3. Chocolate. A sociocultural misunderstanding

NS is a male with L1 English, and the NNS is a female, L1 Spanish and highly competent in English. The NNS is mumbling a song while they are driving. She tries unsuccessfully to remember the song.

	1.	NS:	what are you mumbling?
	2.	NNS:	that song (0.6) hhhhm. hh. what's that woman's name? that singer
TS		(0.2)	
M1	3.		the chocolate woman!
ORI	4.	NS:	areta franklin
M2	5.	NNS:	<u>no</u> !!! she's not black!
ORI2	6.	NS:	you said she was <u>black</u> !
	7.	NNS:	no I did not!
	8.	NS:	yes you did!
	9.	NNS:	NO I DIDN'T
TS	10.	NS:	yes you did. you said that <u>chocolate</u> woman.
M3	11.	NNS:	yes, the one that sings that your love is better than chocolate
ORI/M4	12.	NS:	(0.3) sarah maclofn? she's <u>white</u>
ORI	13.	NNS:	I never said she was <u>black</u> !
	14.	NS:	yes (.) you (.) did
	15.	NNS:	NO <u>I didn't</u> ((frustrated))
	16.	(3.4)	
	17.	NS:	((laughs))
	18.	NNS:	whats so funny↑ ((quite angry))
RS	19.	NS:	honey, a <u>chocolate</u> woman IS a <u>black</u> woman.
AK	20.	NNS:	oh (0.4) how am I supposed to know <u>that</u> ?
TS- Trouble source, M- Misunderstanding, ORI- Other- Repair Initiation, RS- Repair Success, AK- Acknowledge			

In this example the NNS is looking for a name that she cannot remember, as marked by the referential ('that song'), the pause, and the cut speech, as well as the direct question about the name ('what's that woman's name?'). All she can remember are some words of the song (line 3), this is the trouble source, where the miscommunication initiates. In line 4, the NS offers an answer to the question which triggers a misunderstanding and the following interactional negotiation. Although both NS and NNS are trying to repair the breakdown in the communication, subsequent misinterpretations take them deeper in the break. The NS claims that the NNS is talking about a black woman "chocolate woman" (line 3), nevertheless the NNS has associated "chocolate woman" to the words of a song by a singer which is not black, and which sings a song about chocolate. They both have clear concepts of the pragmatic use of the linguistic item and they defend that this is the one that has been used. This is an example of sociocultural miscommunication due to pragmatic knowledge and to the difference between inferences that participants draw. In this case the speaker of English was applying a semantic scope to the word "chocolate" that was culturally specific and was not shared by the Spanish speaker. The participants try to be repair the misunderstanding several times unsuccessfully, until one of them, the only one that has knowledge of both possible pragmatic uses of the word, realizes the misunderstanding. This interaction is also an example that miscommunication is more frequent, and sometimes "dangerous" in conversations with fluent second language speakers than in those with second language learners (Gass and Varonis, 1991, pg 131).

This interaction exemplifies how complicated a misunderstanding can be, and how the repair and restoration of communication may take several turns, time and collaboration from both parts, and how the lack of repair could take to a total break of the communication (line 16), and possible more serious consequences. We can also see that the repair-initiations come from the “other” person, there are not self-initiated repairs in this interaction, probably because both interlocutors are certain they have produced accurate sentences. In lines 4, 6, and 12, it is the NS who starts a miscommunication turn by interpreting (wrongly) the NNS’s words, and it is the NNS that attempts repair, although unsuccessfully. In line 13, the NNS provokes a new misunderstanding while trying to clarify the previous misunderstanding (M3), and it is the NS who tries without success to initiate repair. The repair is finally successful in line 19, initiated by the NS in line 17 through a non-verbal turn, laughter. The NS restores the communication through an explicit explanation of what the pragmatic meaning of the word ‘chocolate’ is for him, making this shared knowledge. The communication is restored as acknowledged by NNS in line 20, ‘how am I supposed to know that?’. In this turn, the speaker categorizes herself as NNS, legitimizing or even claiming the right to not knowing the meaning of the contested lexical item. This interaction exemplifies the reconstruction of a sociocultural misunderstanding between a NNS / NS.

Case 4. At the travel agency

Ann is a NNS of Spanish, L1 English. She is going to a travel agency to book a trip for the weekend to Barcelona for her and three other friends. She takes Joe along. He is also L1 English and his spoken proficiency is not as high as Ann’s, but his listening skills are better, and he had been in Barcelona a few weeks earlier. The travel agent, female, NS of Spanish, is looking at flights but she cannot find a return flight for Sunday.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|------|---|
| | 1. | NS- | no hay más que por la mañana ((she keeps looking))
‘There is only morning ones’ |
| | 2. | Ann- | Si no hay nada por vuelto (.) es posible encontrar algo:: po::r tren?
‘If there is nothing for return (.) is it possible to find something by train?’ |
| | 3. | NS- | por tren no hay nada, porque lo acabo de mirar, ahora mismo, para el regreso |
| | 4. | | no hay nada. entonces tendría que ser ehh 0.2) vamos a ver AirEuro:pa: (.2) |
| | 5. | | a cientocuarentaiun euros si que tenéis para ir
‘There is nothing by train, I have just looked at it, right now, there is nothing to return, then it would have to be ehh (0.2) lets see AirEuro:pa: (.2) at 141 euros you have °one way°’ |
| | 6. | Joe- | ((whispering)) find out if there is space from Valladolid to Barcelona= |
| | 7. | Ann- | ((whispering)) in autobus?
‘by bus?’ |
| | 8. | Joe- | =((whispering)) because what she is saying is that there is no space because |
| | 9. | | they only give certain amount for Salamanca |
| | 10. | Ann- | ((whispering)) ok |
| | 11. | Joe- | ((whispering)) because then you can take the bus to Valladolid [and jump |
| | 12. | Ann | ((whispering)) [and then |
| | 13. | Joe- | ((whispering)) jump in the train there |
| | 14. | Ann- | ((whispering)) () |
| | 15. | NS- | pero bueno tengo dos cupos por ser domingo
‘There are two places because it is Sunday’ |
| | 16. | Ann- | y no hay nada por tren (.) aquí en Salamanca ir a:: Barcelona
‘And there is nothing by train (.) here in Salamanca to go:: Barcelona’ |
| TS | 17. | NS- | no hay nada para regresar de Barcelona ni a Madrid ni a Salamanca, en tren, el domingo
‘There is nothing to come back from Barcelona to Madrid or Salamanca, by train, on Sunday’ |
| | 18. | Ann- | y::: es posible: si: es posible ir a Valladolid primer y despue:s ir en po:r tren a: sa a a Barcelona |

			'And is it possible is possible to go to Valladolid first and then go by train to sa- to Barcelona'
M	19.	NS-	es el mismo tren que va allí
OIR	20.	Ann-	'It is the same train that goes there'
			[es el mismo (.) hmm
			['it is the same one (.) hmm'
	(0.4)		
	21.	NNS-	[es que los fines de semana suele estar bastante complicado, el tren
			['on the weekends it is quite difficult, the train'
	22.	Ann-	°it's strange° ((talking to Joe))
	23.	Ann-	es muy-
			'It's very-'
ORI	24.	Joe-	-pero hay una tren (.) desde hm Valladolid (.2)
			'but there is train (.) from hm Valladolid'
	25.	NS-	si
			'yes'
	26.	Joe-	no hm no pasar Madrid, ° si°
			'it does not to pass Madrid °yes°'
TS	27.	NS-	creo que si.
			'I think it does'
M	28.	Joe-	no (.) es-
			'no (.) is-'
ORI	29.	Ann-	el tren- (1.1) ((travel agent looking in the computer))
			'the train (1.1)'
ORI	30.	Joe-	porque hace::: (.) tres semanas (.) mi mujer y yo (.) hm venir a Barcelona, de Valladolid, (.) y es un (.) ruta diferente
			'Because three weeks ago (.) my wife and I (.) came to Barcelona, from Valladolid (.) and it is a (.) different rout'
SR	31.	NS-	((much softer tone)) hay solamente dos trenes (0.3) eso para la ida vamos a ver
	32.		(0.6) ((reading from computer screen)) a las nueve y veintiocho que es el tre:n
	33.		((talking to herself while looking at the computer)) °puedes ser- este cual es (.)
	34.		este no es° ((mumbling)) (0.8)
			((much softer tone)) 'There is only two trains (0.3) that's the way there lets see
			(0.6) ((reading from computer screen)) at 9:28 that is the train ((talking to herself while looking at the computer)) °could be- this is which one no its is°
			((mumbling)) (0.8)
AK	35.	Ann-	esa es la información ah para ir (.) por tren?
			'That is the information to go (.) b train?'
	36.	NS-	si
			'yes'
	37.	Ann-	de Valladolid?
			'from Valladolid?'
	38.	NS-	°sí°
			°yes°
	39.	Ann-	directamente a (.) Barcelona
			'directly to (.) Barcelona'
	40.	NS-	°sí sí°
			°yes yes°
	41.	Ann-	sí
			'yes'
	(1.2)		((Joe and Ann whispering in English)) ((incomprehensible))
TS	42.	Joe-	but I could swear the train we got on in Valladolid came from Salamanca
	43.	NS-	por desgracia solo hay uno
M			'unfortunately, there is only one'
	44.	Ann-	hay uno por tren
SR			'there is one in each train'
	45.	NS-	solamente hay un tren, pero no sé si hay pla:zas (.) a la una (0.3) del mediodia
			'there is only one train, but I don't know if there are seats (.) at one (0.3)

- AK 80. NS: [eso es.
 ‘[that’s correct.’

(0.2)
81. Ann- Necesitamos encontrar un hotel cuando estamos [en Barcelona si también
 ‘We need to find a hotel when we are [in Barcelona yes too’
82. NS: [en Barcelona
 ‘ [in Barcelona’

In this example the interlocutors are trying to build the interaction through several trouble source lines, in which the trouble is not in the language per se or sociocultural notions proper to the participants, but the content together with language difficulties. The travel agent is looking for an airline ticket (in line 4 she is searching for seats in AirEuropa, a Spanish airline), while the NNSs are asking about the possibilities of traveling by train. The travel agent is not paying much attention to them, and tells them there are no spaces available before checking (line 3) (although she says she has checked before). Meanwhile, both NNSs are talking in English about traveling by train instead through other routs (line 6-14). On line 17 there is a potential problem for the communication when the travel agent tells them that there are no spaces in the train, and the Valladolid train is actually the same train. This turn instead of solving the misunderstanding, takes it to a conversation foreclosure. Ann accepts the content and there is a pause (0.4). It is Joe who tries to re-establish the interaction adding some new information (line 21). He knows that the train that is full and goes through Madrid is not the same one that goes through Valladolid. Nevertheless, the travel agent does not accept his repair and creates a new source of trouble when she affirms that it is the same train. Joe answers with a short 'no' in a categorical prosody, which may be understood as threatening to the maintenance of the interaction (line 28), immediately both Ann and Joe try to soften the threat and Joe explains how he is so sure about his statement (line 30). After this, the NS resumes to a softer tone of voice, more friendly, while she actually looks at the trains on the computer. After the flow of communication is restored we see a confirmation request from Ann (line 35) to make sure they are now referring to the same topic.

This interaction also shows that those misunderstandings that are resolved in a few turns from the interaction are easier to solve than if several turns pass by (Drummond & Hopper, 1991). In line 43 a new trouble source surfaces when the travel agent uses a referential and leaves out the specific noun in a sentence after coming to the conversation from a long pause (1.2). The miscommunication in this case is triggered by the NS's utterance being condensed, including an elliptical word: 'train', to which the NS referred through the use of a pronoun *uno* ('one'). This is a common source of misunderstanding between NS/NNS (Bremer, 1996). Ann does not understand what *uno* ('one') refers to and she inquires about *uno* referring *asiento* ('seat') (line 44), because she is going with three other friends. The misunderstanding is easily resolved in the next turn when the travel agent specifies *un tren* ('a train'). In a similar way, in line 46, Ann creates a new source of miscommunication when she asks if this information is for Friday, the repair is initiated in the following turn and solved at the same time by the NS and Joe (line 48) who clarifies the day. Ann acknowledges the problem has been resolved by associating the day of the week and the travel trajectory correctly (which had been the misunderstanding item). The conversation is re-established by shifting the topic to clarify another point about the trip (line 50).

In line 70 the NS introduces a new trouble source when she tells the price of the tickets in a quite long and complicated series of numbers and specific vocabulary to the raveling by train domain. This difficult utterance comes after an unproblematic sequence (lines 49-69) and when NS are talking to NNs, even if they are usually good at adapting to the linguistic means of a beginner learner, after an unproblematic sequence, they tend to 'lapse back into 'normal' manner of delivery'

(Bremer, 1996, pg. 52). This made the sentence fast and linguistically complex. In addition, the content is strongly rooted in cultural practices. It is necessary to understand how the train system functions in order to understand that the tickets cost depending on the amount of *trayectos* ('legs'). This combination provokes a misunderstanding stated by Ann who thinks this is the total price of the ticket (line 73). The NS immediately initiates the repair of the misunderstanding with an explicit negative to Ann's question, a vocative to attract the hearer's attention, and elaboration on the statement before, this time without using numbers. It is Joe who in line 78, using English, adds the information that repairs the conversation by using English. Ann acknowledges the repair and so does the travel agent that only at this point seems to actually understand English. The interaction is re-established and it is again Ann who continues the interaction by starting a new topic relevant to the service encounter.

This interaction exemplifies how misunderstandings may have several onsets which may be linguistic in origin (lines 43-46), based on different goals by the different participants (lines 17-34), or a combination of linguistic and sociocultural origin (lines 70-79).

And in this interaction we can also see that in spite of being close to total break of communication, the interaction was re-established several times with the collaboration of all participants. In addition the data also shows that a shift of topic is the preferred move after the interaction has been re-established.

Case 5. At the bus station. A very complicated answer to an easy question

Joe is at a Spanish bus station. The employee (Emp) at the ticket window is a male, about 40 years old. There is a glass window between them with a tray in the lower part through which they conduct the money and ticket exchange.

- | | | | |
|----------|-----|------|--|
| | 1. | Joe- | hola,
'hello' |
| | | | ((woman talking on the background, unrelated to conversation)) (.15) |
| | 2. | Joe | hola hay espacio uhhh (.) para dos personas
'hello is there space uhhh for two people' |
| | 3. | E – | para cuantos?
'for how many?' |
| | 4. | Joe- | dos personas a las ocho
'two people at eight' |
| | 5. | Emp- | a Valladolid?
'to Valladolid' |
| | 6. | Joe- | sí
'yes' |
| | 7. | Emp- | hoy?
'today?' |
| TS/
M | 8. | Joe- | hoy(..)y ehh están libros dieci:sieteydieciocho? creo que: es (.) alado salida, (..)y vuelto |
| | 9. | | en domingo
'today (..) and ehh are book (free)17 and 18? I think that it is next to exit, (..) and turn (return) on Sunday' |
| ORI | 10. | Emp- | qué número me dijo? (.) de asiento?
'what number did you+polite tell me? the seat?' |
| | 11. | Joe- | uhmm |
| ORI | 12. | Emp- | sí . pero qué=?
'yes, but what' |
| SRI | 13. | Joe- | =al lado (.) salida (.) emergencia (/emergeryencia/)
'to the side (.) exit (.) emergency' |
| ORI | 14. | Emp- | salida emergencia? e:l treintaicinco treintaiseis?
'emergency exit? the 35 36?' |

- (1.5)
- ORI 15. Emp- o sea está alado de la puerta, el treintaicinco y el treintaseis.
'that is it is next to the door'
- SRI 16. Joe- a sí? . porque soy . alto ah! (.) y un poco mas espacio ah!
'ok? . because I am . tall and a little more space ah!'
- SR 17. Emp- sí ahí está bien, () parte libre de adelante
'yes, that is a good one, () more room in front'
- AK 18. Joe- vale. (..) y **vuelto** en domingo.
'ok. (..) and return(mispronounced) on Sunday'
19. Emp- a la?
'at?'
20. Joe- a las ocho.
'at eight'
21. Emp- ocho de la tarde?
'eight in the evening?'
22. Joe- sí (..) para dos personas sí?
'yes (..) for two people, right?'
- ((Emp is issuing the ticket)) (1.5)
23. Emp- está en () de la linea con tarjeta no se puede pagar lo (siento)
'it is in () of the line with credit card one cannot pay (sorry)'
24. Joe- () tengo dinero
'I have money'
- ((Joe takes out wallet)) (1.9)
25. Emp- veintidós con doce.
'Twenty two with twelve.'
- (1.0)((sound of coins on the window tray)) (1.3)
26. Emp- muy bien! ((Employ puts tickets on tray))
'very good!'
27. Joe- gracias.
'thanks.'
28. Emp- de nada.
'you're welcome.'

In this interaction the trouble source and point of misunderstanding is on line 8, when Joe, the NNS, inquires about the seats in front of the emergency seat. The utterance in line 8 condenses too much information for this type of exchange. So far in the interaction, each sequential pair has resolved one detail of the ticket. Lines 2-4 deal with the number of tickets, lines 5-6 with destination. The employee has been asking a single-answer question in each turn. Line 3 'how many?', line 5 'to Valladolid?'. In line 7 he also asks a question that requires 'yes' or 'no' as an answer. The NNS answers the question ('today'), and without any pause, goes into inquiring about the availability of two concrete seats he think are by the emergency exit and also introduces additional data about the return date. The question was not expected as shown by the employee's turn in which he asks Joe to repeat the numbers ('what numbers did you say?') (line 10), this is the first attempt to repair the miscommunication (other initiated repair). In addition the trouble source turn includes the word *salida* ('exit') but the NNS never produces an audible word *emergencia* ('emergency'). The second part of the employee's utterance (line 10) shows he has not understood Joe's idea of the seats being by the emergency exit. He asks 'what number did you tell me? of seat?' ignoring the key point of the information being that the numbers are not as important as the seats being by the emergency exit. Key point which the NNS tries to get across again when repairing his previous utterance, (line 13). The NNS does not answer this question, seems to be thinking or trying to remember the numbers as by the sound 'uhmmm' (line 11). At this point of breakage it is the NS that tries to rebuild the interaction by asking again (line 12), but he does so in such an ambiguous way that is not clear what he actually asking about. Faced with this ambiguity, the NNS tries to push across his main point (the seats are by the emergency exit), which this time the employer recognizes,

formulating a confirmation requests (line 14) ‘emergency exit?’ and ‘thirty five thirty six?’. Since his questions are not answered by Joe, he goes into elaboration and reformulation of the utterance (line 15). Joe then accepts his seats numbers and the misunderstanding is successfully repaired by the NS who also adds more information about the seats that confirms they are at the emergency exit (‘yes that’s good and they () more room in the front’). The NS acknowledges the repair explicitly ‘vale’ (‘ok’), and re-states the communication by moving into another topic, about the return date (that had been ignored in line 8-9) when the miscommunication developed.

In this interaction the miscommunication, in line 8, was due to several factors: grammatical, pragmatical, and content related. First, the use of a complicated unexpected utterance also charged with grammatical inaccuracies and pauses. The NNS used the word *libros* (‘books’) instead of *libres* (‘free’), and *vuelto* instead of *vuelta*. He also used a direct translation from the English utterance ‘are 17 and 18 available?’, but in Spanish the use of the noun *asientos* (‘seats’) next to the numbers is required (since it had not been used any time before in the interaction). In addition, the answer was not following the expected pattern set by the question, a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ question, and was not following the pattern that the participants had established for the interaction, short questions and answers, interview style. Furthermore, the utterance carried unexpected content, and was pragmatically inappropriate. It is not customary to ask for specific seats when purchasing an autobus ticket, as confirmed by most passengers not seating on their assigned seats, or not knowing where the seat numbers are located (personal experience).

Case 6. Echinacea and pragmlinguistic failure

NNS returns to a shop to buy some Echinacea pills, but they have not arrived yet.

- | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|--|
| | 1. | NNS - | hola,
‘hello’ |
| | 2. | NS - | hola
‘hello’ |
| | 3. | NNS - | hola
‘hello’ |
| | 4. | NS - | a ver!
‘let’s’ |
| | 5. | NNS - | tinene equines[ea?
‘do you have echinacea? (english pronunciation)’ |
| | 6. | NS - | [tardan en llegar porque: no tengo en el almacén de valladolid y |
| | 7. | | las he tenido que pedir a barcelona
‘it takes time to arrive because i don’t have in the supplier in valladolid and
I had to ask barcelona for them’ |
| TS | 8. | NNS - | oh ok (disappointed) |
| | (0.4) | | |
| ORI | 9. | NS - | entonces las tienen que mandar el paquete |
| | (0.3) | | |
| ORI | 10. | NS | lo que pasa es que las tengo en extracto
‘so they have to send the package what it happens is that I have them in extract’ |
| | 11. | NNS - | no (.) no [interesa
‘no (.) not interested’ |
| | 12. | | [no te gusta
‘[you don’t like them’ |
| | 13. | NNS - | no no (0.2) |
| | 14. | NS - | entonces yo espero que el lunes lleguen desde barcelona
‘then i hope they arrive on monday from barcelona’ |
| | 15. | NNS - | oh ok (disappointed) |
| | 16. | NS - | porque tiene que venir el paquete desde allí y tarda más
‘because the package has to arrive from there and it takes longer’ |

17. NNS - ok, (.)
 18. NS - por eso
 ‘that’s why’
 (1.4)
 SR 19. NNS - vale gracias
 ‘ok thanks’
 20. NS - gracias a ti, hasta luego
 ‘thank you, see you later’

Although apparently there is no miscommunication in this interaction, a closer look at the pauses and the NNS’s answers show that there are actually problems on the pragmatics of the social interaction. If we compare this interaction with a similar interaction involving the same seller and another NS a few days earlier, we can see where the problem in this interaction raises.

1. NS- hola
 ‘hello’
 2. Shp- hola. buenas ta:rdes
 ‘hello, good evening’
 3. NS- las velas de limón llegaron ya?
 ‘the lemon candles, have they arrive?’
 4. Shp- no:↓, no tenían en el almacén de aquí ↓
 ‘no: ↓, they didn’t have in the suppliers here↓’
 5. NS- bueno↓, la próxima semana entonces?
 ‘ok↓ next week then?’
 6. Shp- sí, espero que ya estén.
 ‘yes, I hope they are (here)’
 7. NS- vale↓, me paso entonces el lunes
 ‘ok↓, I’ll pass by on Monday then’
 8. Shp- va:le::, hasta lue::go
 ‘ok, see you later’
 9. NS- adiós
 ‘bye’

In this dialogue we can see that the NS in line 5 has understood line 4 as enough explanation for her question in line 3. She confirms the understanding ‘*bueno*’ and the question moves into a different topic, (when are the candles going to arrive). The shop assistant recognizes the pre-closings ‘*vale*’ and the intonation contour of the sentence (line 7) and responds appropriately by ending the conversation.

In contrast, the NNS did fail to recognize the pre-closings from the shop assistant (lines 6-7) as marked by the intonation and the long pause at the end of her turn. Instead of closing the conversation here, the NNS responds with minimal feedback and using an intonation that invited his interlocutor to continue. At the point, the assistant is obliged to continue with another explanation, paraphrasing the excuse that she has given before. It is not until turn 17 that the NNS closes the conversation. This conversation shows that service encounters are different to a regular conversation. In a regular conversation, the NS would have probably ended his/her turn and wait for a closing response, and in the absence of this s/he would have closed the conversation him/herself, letting the NNS confused about the break of communication. However, in a service interaction the shop attendance has as much to loose as the client, and this is motivation enough to keep the communication flow until the client is ready to close it. This is an example of pragmalinguistic failure. This situation usually results in inappropriate behaviour and may lead to the NS thinking that the NNS is impolite or it may even be attributed to an intentionality that does

not necessarily have. From the NNS perspective it is also more difficult to repair because the problem is not salient to them.

Case 7. At the Bank. Different agendas.

NNS enters this bank for the second time. The first time he wanted to change money but the quantity was too large for this branch and they sent him to the main branch. He comes back to ask for directions to the main branch, but the cashier offers to change the money and take it herself to the main branch later. He still needs direction to the other branch because he wants to open an account there, what he doesn't share with the bank teller.

	1.	NNS	hola 'hello'
TS	2.	NS -	los has podido cambiar? 'Have you been able to change them?'
M1	3.	NNS -	lo siento olvidé direcciones 'I am sorry I forgot directions'
ORI1	4.	NS -	perdona? 'Excuse me?'
SRI/M2	5.	NNS -	olvidé::, (.) 'I forgot'
ORI2	6.	NS -	olvida:ste? 'you forgot?'
SRI2	7.	NNS -	sí 'yes'
ORI2	8.	NS -	el qué? 'what?'
SR2	9.	NNS -	y:: dónde está el otra ofcina- 'and where is the other office ((error in agreement))'
AK/SRI	10.	NS -	ah (.) les tienes aquí? (.) les tienes aquí los dólares? ((regional intonat.)) 'ah! (.) do you have them here? (.) do you have them here, the dollars?'
SR1	11.	NNS -	sí 'yes'
	12.	NS -	les has cambiado ya? 'have you changed them already?'
	13.	NNS -	es posible? o necesito [ir a 'is it possible? Or do I need to go to'
	14.	NS -	[sí traelos traelos (.) [te los cambio, sí 'yes bring them (.) I change them, yes'
	15.	NNS -	[ok (.) ok
SIR1	16.	NNS -	pero donde es la otra oficina? 'but where is the other branch?'
SR	17.	NS -	es allí (.) esta calle todo recto (.) 'it's over there (.) this street down'
AK1	18.	NNS -	↑ok
	19.	NS -	pero bueno por si acaso te lo cambio yo aquí y ya está [porque si no_ 'but well, just in case I'll change them for you here and that's it [because if not'
	20.	NNS -	[está bien? ' [is that all right?'
	21.	NS -	ya voy yo (.) luego puedo ir yo sabes 'I'll go myself (.) later, I can go, you know'
	22.	NNS -	oh no!, es posible para mi [es es (English structure) 'oh, no! It is possible for me it's it's'
	23.	NS -	[no (.) para hacértelo mas cómodo (.) déjalo! 'no, to make it easier for you, don't worry!'
	24.	NNS -	ok ((laughing))

This interaction starts by both participants initiating different topics that they would try to carry on without the support of the other participant. This leads inevitably to several miscommunications. The NS, who sent the NNS to another bank to change the money wants to know about this topic: line 2, *los has podido cambiar?* ('did you manage to change them'). We can see from the interaction that the participants know each other and they have talked before about a specific topic as marked by the use of the pronoun *los* ('them') in her opening utterance without its reference noun. On the other hand the NNS comes in the bank with a different purpose, to ask for directions. He doesn't acknowledge the NS's question at all and states his purpose for having come back to the bank, (line 3) *lo siento olvidé direcciones* ('I am sorry I forgot directions'). This turn, which should have been an answer to the question before, (immediate pair), breaks up the flow of the interaction and forces the NS to try to repair by asking directly about the misunderstanding 'excuse me?' (line 4).

The NNS tries to repair this misunderstanding (self initiated repair) by restating the same phrase, but his delay in producing the sentence forces the help of the NS, which tries to elicit the words from him (line 6). Instead the NNS takes this as confirmation check and answers 'yes' instead of finishing his utterance (line 7), this takes the NS to ask more explicitly, by asking exactly about the direct object of the sentence, the element that is still ambiguous, *el qué?* ('what?'). In English 'what' could be asking either about the object or the subject, but in Spanish the use of the article in front of the interrogative particle, makes clear the question is about the direct object of the sentence and not the subject. Finally, the NNS successfully repairs the interaction by rephrasing and clarifying his first statement (line 9). The NS then acknowledges and this misunderstanding is solved. The conversation is rebuilt by the NS, who still has not been able to push her topic into the interaction. This time she asks in a direct way which causes no problem to the interaction and gets her the answer she has searching for since line 2. But still the NNS has not found out where the other bank branch is. He goes back to this topic (line 16) which the NS successfully resolves in line 17 by giving directions. The directions are very vague though ('over there' 'this street all the way to the end'), and if the NNS had followed them he would have never arrived at the bank. Nevertheless, for the NS this topic is not important since she is already helping him at what he is supposed to be doing at the other bank.

Conclusion

Looking again at the research questions, we can now provide some answers, always limited of course, to the reality of the data analyzed. For an overview see Figure 2 on Appendix 1.

Q1: How does misunderstanding occur? (types of misunderstanding). The sources of miscommunication were mainly grammatical (most often lexical), based on content and based on the pragmatics of social interaction.

Q2: Who attempts to repair the miscommunication and how? (types of repair initiation). The repair sequences were initiated both by NS and NNS. The repair was more successful when the repair was done close to the point of misunderstanding. Both self-initiated and other-initiated repairs appeared in the data, and it was usually a combination of both that lead to the successful repair of the interaction, what seems to prove the importance of collaborating to repair the interaction.

Q3: Who repairs the misunderstanding and how is it done? (repair process). The resources that the participants used to repair the interaction varied from visual reference, such as pointing at an element, to full negatives followed by repetitions or reformulations. The data also showed that clarification requests and confirmation checks were often used to initiate the repair sequence. The

repairs were done both by Ns and NNS, although in most of the cases it was the NS who achieved the restoration of the interaction. The strategies that successfully restored the communication vary greatly, from simply supply the lexical item that was the source of trouble to the use of corrective 'no' + supplying the correct information, to the share of pragmatic knowledge that was previously ignored by the NNS. An interesting point is that only 3 strategies of those presented by Tzanne (2000) appeared in the data: speaker corrects in the form 'not X, Y' or 'No, Y'; speakers corrects in form 'Y', and speaker invites hearer non-verbally to consider interpretation'. In addition, clarification requests and confirmation checks, not included in her framework, appeared often in the data.

Q4: What happens after the misunderstanding is repaired? (re-building the interaction). The data illustrates that there is usually some type of acknowledgment that the interaction has been re-established (in all cases except one) as the first step towards the re-construction of the interaction. Both NS and NNS re-established the flow of communication and continued the interaction by using several strategies, although two of them were more frequent: continue the normal pattern of a service interaction, or revert back to information that had been ignored when the communication broke down. These strategies may be a reflection of service encounters interaction, in which both participants have a set goal to reach and collaboration is essential to obtain it. Another interesting point that comes out in this service encounters data is that when NNS are engaged in co-constructing the interaction they actually focus on the content and not simply on the form to maintain a 'polite' conversation without real understanding (cases 1, 2 and 7 especially). This was a point of concern presented by Færch and Kasper (1986), which stated that in studies of negotiation, the participants may be maintaining the conversation to ensure 'formal' rather than 'substantive' understanding.

In general, all interactions show that in order to achieve understanding both participants need to cooperate in the construction of the interaction; and that both misunderstandings and repairs are part of the process of constructing communication. In order to help NNS to be socially competent interactors of a language we need to incorporate the process of co-construction in their language training, paying attention not only to the linguistic component but to the socio-pragmatics involved in the communication process.

As for further research, it would be interesting to develop materials and activities that bring co-construction of interaction to the classroom and find their impact on the students' language and sociopragmatics acquisition. In addition, more research involving NNS needs to be done in different types of encounters, to see what the variations and consistencies of their interactions are. There is a wide-open field of study waiting.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Gabriele Kasper for her insightful comments on the manuscript.

References

- Atkinson, M. and J. Heritage 1984. Eds. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Banks, S., Ge, G, and Baker, J. 1991. Intercultural Encounters and Miscommunication, in: N. Coupland, H. Giles and J. Wiemann, eds. *"Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. 103-120
- Boden, D. and D. Zimmerman 1991. eds. *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bremer, K. 1996. Causes of understanding problems, in: K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, and P. Broeder. *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London, UK: Longman. 37-64.

- Bremer, K. and M. Simonot 1996. Preventing problems of understanding, in: K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, and P. Broeder: *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London, UK: Longman. 159-180.
- Bremer, K., Roberts, C., Vasseur, M., Simonot, M., and Broeder, P. 1996. *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London, UK: Longman.
- Coupland, N., H. Giles and J. Wiemann 1991. *"Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Drummond, K. and R. Hopper 1991. Misunderstanding and Its Remedies: Telephone Miscommunication, in: N. Coupland, H. Giles and J. Wiemann, eds. *"Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Færch, K. and G. Kasper 1986. The role of comprehension in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 7: 257-74.
- Firth, A. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversational analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26: 237-259.
- Gass, S. and E. Varonis 1991. Miscommunication in Nonnative Speaker Discourse, in: N. Coupland, H. Giles and J. Wiemann, eds. *"Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Goffman, E. 1971. *Relations in public. Microstudies of the public order*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin
- Gudykunst, W. B. and S. Ting-Toomey 1990. Ethnic identity, language and communication breakdowns, in: H. Giles and P. Robinson, eds. *Handbook of language and social psychology*. London: John Wiley. 309-328
- Gumperz, J. 1978. The conversational analysis of interethnic communication, in: E. L. Ross, ed. *Interethnic communication: Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Gumperz, J. and D. Tannen 1979. Individual and social differences in language use, in: C. Fillmore, D. Kempler and W.S-Y. Wang, eds. *Individual differences in language ability and language behaviour*. New York: Macmillan. 305-325
- Hall, J. 1993. The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The socio cultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14,2: 145-166.
- Hatch, E. 1978. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition, in: E. Hatch, ed. *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 402-435.
- Hansell, M. and C.S. Ajirotutu 1982. Negotiating interpretations in interethnic settings, in: J. Gumperz, ed. *Language and Social Identity*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 85-94.
- Hewstone, M., and H. Giles 1986. Social groups and social stereotypes in intergroup communication: A review and model of intergroup communication breakdown, in: W. B. Gudykunst, ed, *Intergroup Communication*, London: Edward Arnold. 10-26
- Hinnenkamp, V. 1987. Foreign talk, code switching, and the concept of trouble, in: K. Knapp, W. Enninger, and A. Knapp-Potthoff, eds. *Analyzing intercultural communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 137-180
- Hinnenkamp, V. 1991. Talking a person into interethnic discourse: An analytical case study, in: J. Blommaert and J. Verschueren, eds. *The Pragmatics of International and Intercultural Communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Hinnenkamp, V. 2003. Misunderstandings: Interactional structure and strategic resources, in: J. House, G. Kasper, and S. Ross, eds., *Misunderstandings in Social Life: Discourse Approaches to Problematic Talk*. London, UK: Longman. 57-81
- House, J., G. Kasper and S. Ross eds. 2003. *Misunderstandings in Social Life: Discourse Approaches to Problematic Talk*. London, UK: Longman.
- Hosoda, Y. 2000. Other-Repair in Japanese Conversations between Nonnative and Native Speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11(1): 39-63.
- Koole, T. and D. ten Thije, J. 2001. The reconstruction of intercultural discourse: Methodological considerations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33:571-587.
- Lave, J., and E. Wenger 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, L. 1984. Comprehension and context: Successful communication and communicative breakdown. In P. Trudgill, ed. , *Applied Sociolinguistics*. London: Academic Press. 7-21
- Ochs, E. 1991. Misunderstanding children, in: N. Coupland, H. Giles and J. Wiemann, eds. *"Miscommunication" and Problematic Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pica, T. 1994. Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes. *Language Learning*, 44: 493-527.
- Roberts, C. 1996. A social perspective on understanding: some issues of theory and method. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, and P. Broeder. *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London, UK: Longman. pp 9-36.
- Schegloff, E. 1977. Third turn repair. In G. R Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, and J. Baugh eds. *Towards a social science of language. Papers in honor of William Labov*, 2: 31-44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Schegloff, E. 2000. When 'Others' Initiate Repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21: 205-242.

- Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53: 361-382.
- Schwartz, J. 1980. The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman, ed. *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 138-153
- Tannen, D. 1975. Communication mix and mixup or how linguistics can ruin a marriage. *San Jose State Occasional Papers in Linguistics*. 205-211
- Thomas, J. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 4: 91-109.
- Trosborg, A. 1987. Apology strategies in native/nonnatives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11: 147-167.
- Tzanne, A. 2000. *Talking at Cross-Purposes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Varonis, M. and S. Gass 1985. Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6: 71-90.
- Vasseur, M., P. Broeder and C. Roberts 1996. Managing understanding from a minority perspective. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, and P. Broeder, eds. *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. London, UK: Longman. 65-108.
- Vygotsky, L. 1986. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wagner, J. 1996. Foreign language acquisition through interaction – A critical review of research on conversation adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26: 215-235.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, S. 1989. Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in Society* 18: 59-76.
- Wong, J. 2000. Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 21(2): 244-267.

Eric Hauser: Footing and identity in interaction at a conversation club
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
28-44
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Eric Hauser and the Editors, 2005

Footing and identity in interaction at a conversation club

Eric Hauser

The University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan
hauser@bunka.uec.ac.jp

Abstract

Taking Goffman's concepts of *footing* and *production format* as a foundation, this study analyzes instances of interaction among native and non-native speakers of English in a conversation club at a language school. Following examples of how the production format of a turn may be established, the analysis focuses on the interactional work that is accomplished with different production formats in specific instances. The main generalization that can be drawn about the interactional work accomplished through this generic speaking practice is that it is varied and does not seem to be constrained by the exigencies of interaction in the conversation club. The analysis then shifts to how the establishment of production format provides a resource for the invocation and local constitution of three specific identities of the non-native speakers, as language learners, as language school students, and as members of a culture separate from the native speaker.

Introduction

According to Goffman (1981), the global and lay roles of speaker and hearer are inadequate for an in-depth understanding of the relationships among participants in interaction. Participant roles can be analytically decomposed, allowing for different combinations of these roles, or different types of interactional *footing*. With regard to the global role of speaker,¹ this can be decomposed into the three roles of *animator*, "an individual active in the role of utterance production" (144), *author*, "someone who has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded" (144), and *principal*, "someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told, someone committed to what the words say" (144). These three roles, "taken together, can be said to tell us about the 'production format' of an utterance" (145).

Taking Goffman's (1981) insights into production format as a foundation, this paper presents analyses of interaction among native and non-native speakers of English participating in a conversation club (see below) at an English language school. Starting with specific examples of how the production format of an utterance may be established, this paper then moves on to investigate the interactional work that is accomplished through the use of different production formats in specific instances. This is then followed by an investigation of how specific participant identities – participants as language learners, participants as language school students, and participants as

¹ Goffman (1981) also discusses in detail how the global role of hearer can be analytically decomposed.

members of different cultures – are invoked and locally constituted during and through segments of interaction which involve the establishment of different production formats.

Data and Method

The data analyzed here come from recordings of interaction among native and non-native speakers at a conversation club at an English language school in Honolulu. The conversation club met weekly on a day on which there were no regularly scheduled classes. Non-native speakers attending the school as students, hereafter referred to as *students* or *student participants*, attended the conversation club on a voluntary basis. Native speakers, hereafter referred to as *conversation partners*, as they were labeled by the school, were paid for their participation. At the conversation club, typically between two and four student participants and one or two conversation partners formed conversation groups and talked together in English. (In all of the segments analyzed in this paper, there was always only one conversation partner.) With the oral consent of all participants and of the language school, the data were collected by audio-recording different conversation club groups over the course of two ten-week school terms.

The data thus collected were then transcribed and analyzed based on the transcription and micro-analytic techniques of conversation analysis, in particular as described in Pomerantz and Fehr (1997), Psathas (1995), and ten Have (1999). It should be noted that while the author considers this paper to lie within the realm of conversation analysis, the use of concepts from Goffman, in particular the concepts of animator, author, and principal, but also the concept of *face-work* (Goffman 1967) (see below), is rather unusual in conversation analytic work.² It should also be emphasized that, while transcripts are provided in the text of each segment of interaction analyzed in this paper, the primary data for the analysis are the audio-recordings of the conversation club interaction. All analyses are based on repeated listenings to these recordings.

Examples of Footing in the Conversation Club

One way that the footing, or more specifically the production format, of a particular turn may be indicated is through explicit marking that it has been authored by another. This is illustrated in segment (1).

Segment (1)

P: my mom said you: not ready yet.

The first part of P's turn, "my mom said," marks what follows, "you not ready yet," as having been authored by another. The production format of the second part of the turn has P as the animator and her "mom" as the author. It is irrelevant whether P's "mom" actually spoke these exact words. What is relevant is that the second part of the turn is produced in such a way as to attribute these words to this person.

As segment (2) shows, the author can also be the same person as the current animator, but in a different time and place.

Segment (2)

1 P: my mom said you: not ready yet.

2 (0.4)

² It is not, though, unknown. See Clayman (1992).

3 P: I said ha:lg (0.9) okay

The first part of P's turn in line 3 marks a shift of footing for what follows. Whereas in line 1, P's "mom" was marked as the author, in line 3, P herself is marked as the author of what follows. However, the production format of this turn is not as simple as the animator and the author being identical. Rather, the animator is P speaking now in the conversation club, with the author being P in a different time and place responding to something said by another person who is not currently present.

The words of another can also be animated without the use of verbs such as "said" to explicitly mark the production format, as is shown in segment (3). This segment also illustrates that the author whose words are being animated may be present.

Segment (3)

- 1 C: oh hh I'm: (0.3) compter ((two
- 2 syllables)) game.
- 3 (0.5)
- 4 Y: oh [::
- 5 M: [huh?
- 6 (0.9)
- 7 M: what?
- 8 C: [compute game
- 9 Y: [computer game.

In line 1, C is apparently attempting to utter the compound "computer game." However, M treats what C has said as problematic and initiates repair in line 5 and again in line 7. C completes the repair in line 8, but in overlap with this, Y also completes the repair in line 9, animating words which can be attributed to C as the author.

Segment (4) shows an example of the person animating the words speaking on the behalf of a group.

Segment (4)

- 1 E: but (0.3) chris uh kon uh:
- 2 Valentine's Day, (0.5) Korea and
- 3 Japan, (0.3) uh only women (0.6)
- 4 give (1.5) preth to prest (0.4) for
- 5 (.) to: (0.4) man.

E can be understood as the animator and author of what she says, but by mentioning "Korea and Japan" in lines 2-3, she can also be understood as marking what she is saying as spoken on behalf of the people of these two countries. E is deploying a category, which could be glossed as "the people of Korea and Japan," and producing talk for which the members of this category are the principal.

Finally, segment (5) may be understood as a case in which the animator, author, and principal are united in the same person in the same time and place.

Segment (5)

- 1 E: uh- I have a question=this is a
- 2 (0.3) chris (0.2) Christian
- 3 cus:to:m?

By prefacing her question, which is itself produced syntactically as a statement, with "I have a question," (line 1) E marks herself as the author and principal of the words she is uttering. Again, though, while the production format of the question may be understood as involving the combination of animator, author, and principal in the same person in the same time and place, there is also an ambiguity. What E says comes during a rather long stretch of talk which involves the

students asking their conversation partner questions about Valentine's Day as part of a class homework assignment. Though this is not explicitly marked, a possibility is that E thought of this question at a different time and place, in preparation for completing the assignment, and is using the question preface, "I have a question," to introduce something for which the author is E at an earlier time in a different context.

Footing and Interactional Work

As Clayman (1992) has argued and clearly illustrated, the establishment of footing is a generic speaking practice that is deployed to accomplish specific interactional work in specific instances. In the news interviews analyzed by Clayman, this interactional work involves taking a neutralistic stance appropriate to news interviewers. As such, footing in these cases can be seen as working to meet the constraints and exigencies of the news interview context. In the conversation club interaction, the particular interactional work that is accomplished through turns which involve the establishment of footing, or more specifically the production format, is more varied, which is not surprising as there do not seem to be institutional constraints requiring participants to adopt particular stances.

Segment (6) provides a nice illustration of the type of interactional work that can be accomplished through turns involving the explicit marking of production format.

Segment (6)

1 (2.7)

2 P: I never try (0.4) never.

3 T: you never trie[d TOEFL?]

4 P: [no:] uh-uh

5 (0.5)

6 T: you know I had tuh [take the TOEFL=

7 P: [my: mo:m said

8 T: =for h(h)ere

9 ?: ha ha .h ha ha [.hh ha ((female))

10 P: [my mom said you:

11 not ready yet.

12 (0.4)

13 P: I said ha:lg [(0.9) okay

14 ?: [ha ha ha[ha ha

15 ((female))

Prior to this segment, the participants, primarily P and T, have been discussing an upcoming opportunity to take the institutional TOEFL, a cheaper version of the English proficiency test which international applicants are required to take by many institutions of higher learning in the U.S. Following the rather long pause in line 1, P shifts the topic by mentioning that she has never tried, or will never try, something, which in the local context is likely to be the TOEFL, though it is ambiguous whether she is referring to the institutional TOEFL, or the more expensive regular version of the test, or both. Note that it is also ambiguous whether she is stating that she has never tried the TOEFL, leaving open the possibility that she may try it in the future, or that she will never try it. P's turn is hearably complete following the word "try," but this gets no immediate response and P then repeats the word "never" following a 0.4 second pause. At this point, T responds in a manner that removes some of the ambiguity of what P has said. In stating "you never tried TOEFL," T takes what P has said as referring only to the past, leaving open the possibility that she may try it in the future, and also takes what P has said as, on the one hand, tied to the discussion prior to the

pause in line 1, and on the other, as not referring specifically to the institutional TOEFL. In line 4, P confirms how T has taken what she has said with two negative tokens, “no” and “uh-uh.” The first is produced in overlap with the end of T's turn, before he has completed the articulation of “TOEFL,” while the second comes in the clear. With these tokens, P indicates that how T has taken what she has said in line 2 is unproblematic.

T's turn in line 3, though, does more than display how he has taken what P has said. The partial repetition and the rising intonation also index surprise, indicating that it is unexpected that P, as a student at the English language school who presumably has ambitions to enter an institution of higher learning in the U.S., has never tried the test. In addition, as P in line 2 treats the fact that she has never tried the TOEFL as something worth mentioning, she can also be heard to orient to this information as unexpected, or at least not obvious. Given that this information is taken as unexpected, and even surprising, P can be expected, following T's turn in line 3, to provide a reason for not having taken the test. This reason, though, is not forthcoming, resulting in a 0.5 second pause in line 5. Following this pause, T does not pursue a reason from P, but rather introduces his own surprising piece of information in lines 6 and 8, which is that he was required to take the TOEFL. Given that T is a conversation partner, presumably a native speaker of English,³ such information would seem to be unexpected and surprising, and T can be heard to orient to this nature of what he says through his laughter token in line 8 as well as through the fact that he takes this information as something worth mentioning. In line 9, one of the other participants responds to what T has said by laughing, showing her orientation to what T has said as humorous, perhaps due to its being unexpected and surprising.

In line 7, though, P is pursuing her own line of talk. In overlap with the middle of T's turn, she produces: “my mom said,” but then abandons this, perhaps because it is in overlap. Her abandonment of what she is saying is only temporary, though, as she then recycles “my mom said” in line 10, in overlap with the laughter response to what T has said, and completes her turn by animating the words of her “mom,” placed in the role of author, in lines 10-11. As discussed in the previous section, this involves the explicit marking of the production format of the second part of her turn. After this gets no response, resulting in a pause in line 12, she then produces another turn which explicitly marks the production format, with herself, in another time and place in interaction with a currently non-present participant, as the author of the second part of her turn.

The interactional work accomplished by P's turns in lines 10-11 and line 13 is to provide the reason that she has never taken the TOEFL, which would seem to have been expected earlier, following T's turn in line 3, but was not forthcoming. In addition, it also has the effect of sequentially erasing T's turn in lines 6 and 8, as well as the response laughter in line 9. In abandoning her turn in line 7, P can be heard to orient to T as having laid claim to the floor, as being in the midst of a turn. However, after T has completed his turn, rather than responding to what T has said in lines 6 and 8, P produces a turn designed as a response to what T has said in line 3. While the reason that P gives, in turns involving the explicit marking of production format, serially follows T's second turn in this segment, it sequentially follows his first turn.

³As is discussed in the next section, T immigrated to the U.S. with his family when he was six years old. (I learned this from something he told the student participants.) However, there is nothing in the way he talks that would indicate, to this author, that he is not a native speaker of English and he does not seem to categorize himself as a non-native speaker.

As discussed previously, production format can be established without explicit marking, as in segments (7) and (8), which involve the same participants, with segment (8) coming a short time after segment (7). (The name used in the transcript is a pseudonym.)

Segment (7)

- 1 (1.4)
- 2 H: Setsuko we ca:n research for (1.2)
- 3 for: for:
- 4 M: oh [for your class?
- 5 S: [(the class)?
- 6 S: ah-
- 7 H: mm
- 8 S: yeah
- 9 M: it's for your (.) for your class?
- 10 S: (but)=
- 11 H: =yes [oh-
- 12 M: [yeah no problem,

Segment (8)

- 1 H: yeah ou:r: (0.4) uh:- (0.3) we:
- 2 uh: same (.) uh we have (0.4) take
- 3 a: (0.4) [(.)] same classes.=
- 4 ?: [°same°] ((female))
- 5 M: =mm-hm=
- 6 H: =°yes° .h [we:- (0.5)] we=
- 7 ?: [(xx) (sometimes)] ((female))
- 8 H: = do:- (0.5) ha (0.5) our homework?
- 9 M: uh-huh
- 10 H: °we will° .h uh: (0.4) American?
- 11 or: conversation partner?
- 12 M: okay=
- 13 H: =some question? [(.)] is about=
- 14 M: [sure]
- 15 H: =Valentine Day:s,=
- 16 M: =okay okay

The talk prior to segment (7) has involved the conversation partner, M, getting the names of the students in the group. Following the 1.4 second pause in line 1, H shifts the topic through a turn, in lines 2-3, explicitly addressed to another student participant. However, she shows difficulty completing her turn, pausing 1.2 seconds after saying “for” and then repeating “for” twice. In line 4, M completes H's turn for her, with the change-of-state token (Heritage 1984) at the beginning and the rising intonation at the end together indexing tentative understanding of what H is trying to say. The production format of M's “for your class” is rather complex, with M as the author of the words and H as the principal, but also with the rising intonation indexing the tentativeness of M's own understanding. S, who has been explicitly addressed by H, responds in lines 5 and 6, first, apparently, also providing a completion of H's turn, and then showing recognition of what H is talking about by saying “ah.” Following a further exchange between H and S in lines 7-8, M initiates repair in line 9 by asking if his tentative understanding is correct, which H confirms in line 11. M then responds in line 12 with “yeah no problem,” apparently acquiescing to a request that he takes H to have made. It is interesting to note that while H marks her turn in lines 2-3 as addressed to another student, M takes it as a request addressed to him.

Following segment (7), the talk returns to the task of M getting the names of the students in the group, prior to the start of segment (8). In this segment, H produces a fair amount of talk in lines 1-3, 6 and 8, 10-11, and 13 and 15. Due to the non-target-like nature of what H says, it is difficult to determine unambiguously how many possibly complete turns she produces in this segment, but she appears to produce four possibly complete turns, one in lines 1-3, a second in lines 6 and 8, a third in lines 10-11, and a fourth in lines 13 and 15. In lines 5 and 9, M produces continuers, orienting to H as being in the midst of a multi-unit stretch of talk. Although H produces nothing which can be heard as a direct request or a conventionally indirect request, as in segment (7) M orients to what H says as a request, producing tokens of acquiescence in lines 14 and 16, with his “okay” in line 12 being ambiguous as to whether it is a third continuer or a first token of acquiescence.

These two segments illustrate how the establishment of production format can be an interactive accomplishment. That H has made a request of M, which appears to be for M to participate in a homework assignment, emerges from the manner in which M takes H's talk. If H is understood as making a request, as M takes her to be doing, then in segment (8) her use of “our” (line 1), “we” (line 1), “same” (line 2), “we” (line 2), “same” (line 3), “we” (line 6, twice), “our” (line 8), and “we” (line 10), as well as “we” in line 2 of segment (7), can be understood as indicating that she is making the request on behalf of a group of which she is a member, specifically the group of student participants in this interaction who are in the same class and need to complete the same homework assignment. In other words, H is the author of her talk, but the group as a whole is the principal on whose behalf she is making her request. The interactional work can be understood as involving face-work, to adopt another term from Goffman (1967). In particular, following Brown and Levinson's (1978) expansion of the concept of face, H can be heard as working to protect her own positive face, as a request made on behalf of the group of students is less selfish than would be a request made on behalf of herself only. In addition, H can be heard as working to protect M's negative face, as M, in his institutional role as conversation partner, is responsible for talking with all student members of this conversation club group, something which he would be less able to do if the request to participate in the homework assignment had been made on behalf of H alone, but which he is quite able to do with the request being made on behalf of all student members of this group. Acquiescing to the request thus puts minimal additional constraints of M's freedom of action in his institutional role as conversation partner.

As the interaction which follows segments (7) and (8) involves the student participants asking M questions about Valentine's Day, questions which may be predetermined, there appears to be nothing problematic with M taking H's talk as being a request made on behalf of the group. Segments (9) and (10) illustrate some of this questioning.

Segment (9)

- 1 (0.6)
- 2 E: uh- I have a question=this is a
- 3 (0.3) chris (0.2) Christian
- 4 cus:to:m?=
5 M: =no not Christian

Segment (10)

- 1 M: so m::en give to: (.) women.
- 2 E: [yes
- 3 ?: [yes ((female))
- 4 M: oh::
- 5 S: mm (0.3) okay ah- ja may I ask a
- 6 qu(h)est(h)ion? (t)heh=

7 M: =sure sure sure=
 8 S: =mm .hh uh- (0.3) do you send
 9 Valentine Day's card to:- (0.4)
 10 anyone?
 11 (0.7)
 12 M: uh: (0.3) no ha ha .hh

The talk prior to segment (9) has involved M answering a question from a student other than E. Following the 0.6 second pause in line 1, E claims the floor by saying “uh” and then stating “I have a question.” She then immediately begins to produce her question, though the second half is not produced without difficulty. As discussed in the previous section, the production format of E's question, which she explicitly marks by the question preface, involves E as the animator, author, and principal, though the author may also be understood as E in a different time and place, if the question has been determined prior to the conversation club meeting. The talk prior to segment (10) has involved a discussion, prompted by student questions, of different Valentine's Day gift-giving customs in different countries, with the talk in lines 1-4, and possibly S's “mm” at the start of line 5, involving the closing down of talk about White Day, a day (March fourteenth) in Japan which is related to Japanese Valentine's Day gift-giving customs. Following a 0.3 second pause, S claims the floor by saying “okay ah ja” and then asking permission to ask a question and laughing. M grants permission in line 7 and then S asks her question, following some hesitation, in lines 8-10. As with E in segment (9), the production format of S's question, explicitly marked by her preface in lines 5-6, involves S as animator, author, and principal, though again the author can be understood as S in a different time and place.

Though the request for M to participate in this homework assignment, made in segments (7) and (8) above, was made on behalf of the group, each student participant in the group has different questions and must claim the opportunity to ask their questions. The question prefaces in segments (9) and (10) not only mark the production format of the questions that follow, they also partially accomplish the interactional work of claiming such an opportunity for individual students, of marking a transition to a new question. In segment (9), the preface accomplishes this in conjunction with “uh.” In segment (10), the preface accomplishes this in conjunction with “okay ah ja.” It is interesting to note that S not only uses the English “okay,” but also the Japanese “ja” to index her orientation to the prior discussion having been brought to a close,⁴ opening up an opportunity to claim the floor for a new question.

Segment (11) illustrates the accomplishment of very different interactional work.

Segment (11)
 1 M: how bout you (0.3) what's your
 2 hobby.
 3 (0.6)
 4 C: oh hh I'm: (0.3) compter ((two
 5 syllables)) game.
 6 (0.5)
 7 Y: oh[::
 8 M: [huh?
 9 (0.9)

⁴ My own intuition as a proficient non-native speaker of Japanese tells me that one of the uses of the discourse marker “ja,” and the related “dewa,” is to index transition to a new topic, as it appears to be doing here. This intuition has been confirmed by native speakers familiar with the study of interaction, but I have not been able to find any discourse analytic or conversation analytic work on the use of this particular Japanese discourse marker.

10 M: what?
 11 C: [compute game
 12 Y: [computer game.
 13 M: oh computer game.=
 14 C: =ye[:s
 15 M: [oh: (there you go) what kind of
 16 game.
 17 (0.8)

In lines 1-2, M asks C a question. C does not respond immediately, though, resulting in a 0.6 second pause before he answers the question. This answer gets no immediate response, but in line 7, Y displays understanding of what C has said by producing an elongated change-of-state token. In overlap with this, M indexes lack of understanding by initiating repair in line 8. This, though, gets no response, resulting in a 0.9 second pause in line 9, and M reinitiates repair in line 10. The repair is then completed simultaneously by both C and Y in lines 11 and 12, to which M responds by producing his own change-of-state token and repeating “computer game” in line 13, indexing that he has now come to understand what he previously could not. Following C’s confirmation in line 14, M goes on to comment on C’s answer and to ask a follow-up question.

As discussed in the previous section, the production format of Y’s turn in line 12 involves herself as animator and C as author and principal. The interactional work accomplished by this turn is the completion of repair. The trouble source targeted by M’s repair initiations in lines 8 and 10 is C’s answer in lines 4-5, so it is rather unusual that Y chooses to complete the repair. However, the repair completion itself has become problematic, as M’s first initiation (line 8) has received no response, prompting him to reinitiate (line 10). In addition, with her change-of-state token in line 7, Y indicates that she understands C’s answer to M’s question, so that what is targeted as a trouble source by M is not treated as a trouble source by Y. With the completion of the repair having become problematic, but with the trouble source not being problematic for Y, Y is in a position to aid C by completing his repair for him, animating his words on his behalf. The repair is successfully completed in lines 11 and 12, but the possibility remains that, had Y not stepped in to complete the repair, C would not have been able to successfully complete it on his own. In any case, none of the participants can be heard to treat Y’s repair completion as problematic and the interaction continues as M comments on C’s answer to his question and asks his follow-up question.

Segment (12) presents a final case of interactional work that may be accomplished with a particular production format.

Segment (12)
 1 M: [(xx)
 2 E: [but (0.3) chris uh kon uh:
 3 Valentine’s Day, (0.5) Korea and
 4 Japan, (0.3) uh only women (0.6)
 5 give (1.5) preth to prest (0.4) for
 6 (.) to: (0.4) man.
 7 M: oh yeah? (.) [so the men don’t=
 8 S: [(women)
 9 M: =give to (0.5) women?
 10 (1.3)

As discussed in the previous section, by saying “Korea and Japan” in lines 3-4, E marks her turn as being produced on behalf of a group, which could be glossed as “the people of Korea and Japan.” E is the author of what she is animating, but this group can be understood as the principal. In this

segment, E is drawing a contrast between Valentine's Day gift-giving customs in, on the one hand, Korea and Japan and, on the other, a different country or culture, presumably the U.S., as M is from, and a cultural member of, the U.S. M responds to what E has said by treating it as new information, saying "oh yeah" with rising intonation, and then asking for clarification of what has been implied, that "the men don't give to women." By responding in this way, M can be heard to treat the information that E has provided about "Korea and Japan" as contrasting with Valentine's Day gift-giving customs that he is familiar with. The interactional work that is accomplished through the use of a production format in which the group "the people of Korea and Japan" is the principal is to make it clear that E is drawing a cultural contrast.

Producing turns with different production formats is a generic speaking practice that accomplishes specific interactional work as it is used in specific instances. Based on the examples in this section, it appears that the main generalization that can be drawn about the interactional work accomplished through this generic speaking practice is that it is varied and does not seem to be constrained by the exigencies of interaction in the conversation club. However, as will be illustrated in the next section, an understanding of the interactional work that is accomplished can provide a foundation for understanding how this generic speaking practice is deployed in the invocation and local constitution of particular participant identities.

Footing and the Constitution of Identity

The concern of this section turns to how footing is involved in invoking and, more importantly, constituting particular identities. In particular, this section focuses on the identity of the student participants as 1) language learners, 2) language school students, and 3) as members of a culture separate from that of the conversation partner. Analysis of how this last type of identity is invoked and constituted also illustrates what Mori (2003) has termed the construction of *interculturality*.

Being a language learner. Some of the ways that an analyst may feel justified in classifying the student participants in the conversation club are as non-native speakers, second language speakers, or second language learners. However, while such labels may be perfectly accurate, they do not necessarily reflect how the participants view themselves. More importantly, even if the student participants view themselves as belonging to categories such as second language learner, which does seem to be the case, it does not follow that this identity is always relevant.⁵ This subsection looks at cases in which the identity of being a second language learner is made relevant, either through being explicitly invoked or through more subtle means, and how being a language learner is locally constituted.⁶

Segments (13) and (14), which were not analyzed above in terms of production format, provide examples of how the identity of second language learner can be invoked, by either the conversation partner or a student participant.

Segment (13)

- 1 F: if I- (0.4) just spea- (.) speak
- 2 Japane:se here. (1.0) not (1.6)
- 3 no:- (1.2)

⁵I have argued elsewhere (Hauser 2003) that the role of language learner is *omnirelevant* (Sacks 1992) in the interaction in the conversation club. This does not entail, though, that it is always relevant.

⁶By the term *locally constituted*, I am referring to how an identity is constituted in a specific instance of interaction. What could be labeled as the same identity, e.g., second language learner, could be constituted differently in different specific instances.

4 T: point=
 5 F: =same as- no point.
 6 T: yeah
 7 (0.5)
 8 F: just same as (.) Japan.
 9 T: yeah yeah
 10 F: °(so)° (0.5) why: why did I come
 11 here.
 Segment (14)
 1 T: I got this job just cuz (0.7) I
 2 don't know I sorta: know: how you
 3 guys feel (.) [just because (.) you=
 4 ?: [mm
 5 T: =know like I have four older
 6 brothers and they're all (0.7)
 7 really old yeah, (.) [so (0.4)
 8 ?: [mm
 9 T: when they came here they they were
 10 like you guys

In segment (13), F orients to being a first language speaker of Japanese who came “here” (lines 2 and 11) as a language learner. She states that coming “here” would have “no point” (line 5) if she were to speak Japanese, implying that her purpose for coming “here” is to speak English. The conversation partner, T, displays his ability to empathize with what F is saying, producing “yeah” (line 6) and “yeah yeah” (line 9) and by helping F complete a word search in line 4. The production format of line 4 is worth examining more closely. In lines 2-3, F displays difficulty finding the word she wants, saying “not,” pausing 1.6 seconds, saying “no” in an elongated manner and cutting off, and then pausing again. After the pause has continued for 1.2 seconds, T offers the word “point.” The production format of this turn involves T as the author, as he is not animating something that F has said, and F as the principal, as “point” is being offered as the word that F is searching for to complete her description of her own feelings. In line 5, F cuts off what she has started to say and accepts the word that T has offered, saying “no point.” Through her explanation of why she came “here,” F can be heard as orienting to an identity as a language learner, an orientation which T finds unproblematic.

In segment (14), T is explaining why he got the job that he has at the language school.⁷ In lines 2-3, he classifies the other participants in the group as belonging together as “you guys” and claims the ability to empathize with them, saying “I sort of know how you guys feel.” He then provides a reason for his ability to empathize in lines 3, 5-7, and 9-10. In providing this reason, he states that he has “four older brothers” (lines 5-6) who are “really old” (line 7) and that at one time, “when they came here” (line 9), they were similar to the student participants, “they were like you guys” (lines 9-10). In order to understand what T is talking about here, it is helpful to know that he is actually a first language speaker of Japanese who moved to the U.S. with his family when he was six years old. As he provides his reason for being able to empathize with the student participants, he somewhat implicitly categorizes his brothers as, at one time, being second language learners of English. In stating that “they were like you guys,” he can also be heard as placing the student participants in the same category, so that “you guys” can be heard as “you guys who are trying to

⁷ Unlike other conversation partners, T's job at the language school includes responsibilities besides participation in the conversation club.

learn English in the U.S.,” and thus as orienting to the identity of the student participants as second language learners. Note also, though, that T does not place himself in the same category, but rather simply claims the ability to empathize with members of the category. According to supposedly objective analyst’s criteria, it may be possible to categorize T as a non-native speaker, but this does not seem, at least in this instance, to be a way that T categorizes himself.

Segments (13) and (14) not only involve the invocation of identity as second language learners, but also involve the local constitution of what a second language learner is. In segment (13), being a language learner is constituted as someone who needs opportunities to speak the language being learned, as well as someone who may need assistance, such as that provided by T in line 4 and accepted by F in line 5, with using the language. In segment (14), being a language learner is constituted as belonging to a group the members of which T’s own life experience allows him to empathize with. In addition, it is constituted as involving age, perhaps as being too old to simply pick up the language naturally as a child. Segment (15), which was analyzed in previous sections, also illustrates how being a language learner may be constituted.

- Segment (15)
- 1 (2.7)
 - 2 P: I never try (0.4) never.
 - 3 T: you never trie[d TOEFL?]
 - 4 P: [no:] uh-uh
 - 5 (0.5)
 - 6 T: you know I had tuh [take the TOEFL=
 - 7 P: [my: mo:m said
 - 8 T: =for h(h)ere
 - 9 ?: ha ha .h ha ha [.hh ha ((female))
 - 10 P: [my mom said you:
 - 11 not ready yet.
 - 12 (0.4)
 - 13 P: I said ha:lg [(0.9) [okay
 - 14 ?: [ha ha ha [ha ha
 - 15 ((female))

As discussed previously, the production format of the second half of P’s turn in lines 10-11 involves herself as animator and her “mom” as author and principal, while the production format of the second half of her turn in line 13 involves herself in the conversation club interaction as animator and herself in a different time and place as the author. P’s reporting of this exchange between herself and her mother, which provides the reason that she has not taken the TOEFL, implicitly invokes her identity as a second language learner, constituting this identity as involving progress towards a particular goal, in this case being “ready” (line 11) to take an important language proficiency test. Note also that it is implied through the words of “mom” that, while this goal has not “yet” (line 11) been reached, it eventually will be. Finally, as a second language learner, P is constituted as someone who is in a position to have her language proficiency judged by another, presumably a more competent speaker, and who must accept this judgment.

Segment (16) shows how even a relatively brief turn can involve the local constitution of different participants as different types of second language learners.

- Segment (16)
- 1 M: how bout you (0.3) what’s your
 - 2 hobby.
 - 3 (0.6)

4 C: oh hh I'm: (0.3) compter ((two
 5 syllables)) game.
 6 (0.5)
 7 Y: oh [:
 8 M: [huh?
 9 (0.9)
 10 M: what?
 11 C: [compute game
 12 Y: [computer game.
 13 M: oh computer game.=
 14 C: =ye[:s
 15 M: [oh: (there you go) what kind of
 16 game.
 17 (0.8)

As discussed previously, the production format of Y's turn in line 12 involves herself as animator and C as author and principal. C can be heard as having difficulty keeping up his side of the interaction between himself and M, as he does not respond to M's first initiation of repair in line 8, this prompting M to reinitiate repair, following a 0.9 second pause, in line 10. By stepping in to complete the repair for C, albeit in overlap with C's own completion, Y can be heard to be orienting to this difficulty, providing C with the help he needs to act as a competent participant in the interaction. If this difficulty with participating in the interaction is understood as a result C's being a second language learner, then Y's turn in line 12 can be understood as constituting C as someone who needs assistance using his second language, even assistance from another second language learner. Even though Y herself is a student participant, she can here be heard to behave as someone with enough competence in her second language to provide help to someone less competent.

Being a language school student. In the interaction in the conversation club, the participants can at times be heard to orient to the identity of language school student, which is not logically equivalent to being a second language learner, as one may learn a language without attending school.⁸ In segment (15) above, the fact that P has never tried the TOEFL is treated as surprising by T, prompting P to, eventually, provide a reason for this state of affairs. Both T and P can be heard to orient to P as a student at this particular language school, a school where students are encouraged to take the TOEFL and which many students eventually leave to enter an institution of higher learning in the U.S. In segments (17) and (18), there is a much more explicit orientation to the student participants being students.

Segment (17)
 1 (1.4)
 2 H: Setsuko we ca:n research for (1.2)
 3 for: for:
 4 M: oh [for your class?
 5 S: [(the class)?
 6 S: ah-
 7 H: mm
 8 S: yeah
 9 M: it's for your (.) for your class?
 10 S: (but)=
 11 H: =yes [oh-

⁸ It would also seem to be possible to attend a language school but not actually to learn any of the language.

12 M: [yeah no problem,
Segment (18)
1 H: yeah ou:r: (0.4) uh:- (0.3) we:
2 uh: same (.) uh we have (0.4) take
3 a: (0.4) [(.)] same classes.=
4 ?: [°same°] ((female))
5 M: =mm-hm=
6 H: =°yes° .h [we:- (0.5)] we=
7 ?: [(xx) (sometimes)] ((female))
8 H: = do::- (0.5) ha (0.5) our homework?
9 M: uh-huh
10 H: °we will° .h uh: (0.4) American?
11 or: conversation partner?
12 M: okay=
13 H: =some question? [(.)] is about=
14 M: [sure]
15 H: =Valentine Day:s,=
16 M: =okay okay

As discussed previously, H can be heard in both these segments as speaking on behalf of the group, that is, with the group as principal. The participants not only treat H as making a request on behalf of the group, but also indicate that the request is on behalf of the group as a group of language school students taking the same class. This can be heard in M's "for your class" in lines 4 and 9 of segment (17) and in H's "same classes" in line 3 of segment (18). As students, the members of the group have a "homework" (segment (18), line 8) assignment for which they need the assistance of another, an "American" (segment (18), line 10) or a "conversation partner" (segment (18), line 11).

As the interaction continues following segment (18), the student participants take turns, in the role of language school students completing a homework assignment, asking questions of M about Valentine's Day, as illustrated in segments (19) and (20).

Segment (19)
1 (0.6)
2 E: uh- I have a question=this is a
3 (0.3) chris (0.2) Christian
4 cus:to:m?=
5 M: =no not Christian
Segment (20)
1 M: so m::en give to: (.) women.
2 E: [yes
3 ?: [yes ((female))
4 M: oh::
5 S: mm (0.3) okay ah- ja may I ask a
6 qu(h)est(h)ion? (t)heh=
7 M: =sure sure sure=
8 S: =mm .hh uh- (0.3) do you send
9 Valentine Day's card to:- (0.4)
10 anyone?
11 (0.7)
12 M: uh: (0.3) no ha ha .hh

In each of these segments, one of the student participants claims a turn to ask M one of their own questions. In segment (19), E does this by producing “uh I have a question” and then immediately asking her question. In segment (20), S does this by producing “okay ah ja may I ask a question,” waiting for a response from M, and then asking her question. As discussed in previous section, the student participants can be heard to be treating the prior discussion, involving M’s answer to another student’s question, as complete and as there being an opportunity for a new question related to the homework assignment. In each of these four segments ((17), (18), (19), and (20)), the student participants’ identity as language school students is invoked, either explicitly, as in segments (17) and (18), or implicitly through the taking of turns to ask their questions, and locally constituted as involving the need to complete a homework assignment with the assistance of M. In addition, the conversation club is treated as a legitimate place to complete the homework assignment, just as M is treated as a legitimate person to request assistance from. For his part, in acquiescing to the request to participate, in answering the questions, and in not attempting to move the interaction on to something else, M can also be heard to share this orientation.

The construction of interculturality. As Mori (2003) has argued and empirically demonstrated, rather than being taken as given when participants in interaction come from different cultural backgrounds, interculturality can be understood as constructed by the participants locally as they orient to these different backgrounds. In segments (17) through (20) above, the participants can be heard to have such an orientation as they complete a homework assignment which involves asking a member of a different culture questions about Valentine’s Day.⁹ In particular, in segment (19), as E asks a question about whether there is a relationship between Valentine’s Day and Christianity, and as M answers that there is no such relationship, these two participants are oriented to the possession of different cultural knowledge, with E lacking knowledge of whether there is a connection between Valentine’s Day and Christianity and M possessing such knowledge. Neither of these two participants, or the other participants in the group, appear to treat this difference in the possession of cultural knowledge as problematic. The cultural identity of E and M is locally constituted as involving the possession of different cultural knowledge.

Segment (21) illustrates an interesting case of the construction of not only interculturality, but what could also be termed as *intraculturality*.

- Segment (21)
- 1 M: [(xx)
 - 2 E: [but (0.3) chris uh kon uh:
 - 3 Valentine’s Day, (0.5) Korea and
 - 4 Japan, (0.3) uh only women (0.6)
 - 5 give (1.5) preth to prest (0.4) for
 - 6 (.) to: (0.4) man.
 - 7 M: oh yeah? (.) [so the men don’t=
 - 8 S: [(women)
 - 9 M: =give to (0.5) women?
 - 10 (1.3)

Prior to this segment, the interaction has involved a discussion of Valentine’s Day gift-giving customs in the U.S. As discussed previously, the production format of E’s turn in lines 2-6 involves E speaking on behalf of “Korea and Japan” (lines 3-4), or with the people of these two countries being the principal. E introduces what she is about to say with “but” (line 2), indicating that she is

⁹ Less locally, the teacher who gave the students this assignment must also have been oriented to the students being members of foreign cultures.

building a contrast. This is followed by a pause and then some talk that is difficult to interpret, “chris uh kon uh,” before she indicates that she is still talking about “Valentine’s Day” in line 3. Following another pause, she then explicitly marks that she is talking about “Korea and Japan,” in contrast, given the prior context, to the U.S. Finally, in lines 4-6, she states, with a fair amount of disfluency, what the gift-giving custom for Valentine’s Day is in “Korea and Japan,” which is, somewhat simplified, that “only women” (line 4) “give” (line 5) “to man” (line 6). In lines 7 and 9, M responds to this in a way that treats it as something which he has not heard before. At the beginning of line 7, he produces “oh yeah” with rising intonation, indexing that this is new knowledge for him. He then seeks confirmation of what has been implied by E by saying, with rising intonation, “so the men don’t give to women.”

Both E and M are constructing interculturality, as E introduces this information about gift-giving customs in “Korea and Japan” as contrasting with gift-giving customs in the U.S., and as M responds to this information as being something which he has not heard before. It is also interesting to note, though, that in the way that E introduces the contrasting gift-giving customs, in particular in the way that she marks the production format as speaking on behalf of “Korea and Japan,” E also constructs intraculturality. She presents these two different countries as sharing the same Valentine’s Day gift-giving customs, implying a cultural relationship. In addition, E, who is Japanese, presents herself as having knowledge of Valentine’s Day gift-giving customs in Korea. Looking at this segment alone, it seems rather mysterious that E should choose to speak on behalf of “Korea and Japan,” rather than just on behalf of “Japan.” As it turns out, though, two of the student participants in this group, E and S, are Japanese, while the third, H, is Korean, with all three participants asking M questions in order to complete their homework assignment. By designing the production format of her utterance as she does, E constructs the three student participants as sharing the same cultural background, at least as far as these gift-giving customs are concerned. That is, she constructs intraculturality among the three student participants. The cultural identity of these three student participants is locally constituted as being shared and in contrast with the cultural identity of the conversation partner.

Needless to say, the invocation and local constitution of identity are not directly tied to the establishment of the production format. However, this generic speaking practice provides one resource for invoking and constituting identity in interaction. An understanding of the interactional work that is accomplished through this generic speaking practice can provide the foundation for understanding what might be called the identity work that this practice is used to accomplish in particular instances. This provides that analyst with a valuable viewpoint on the construction of identity in face-to-face interaction.

Conclusion

The interaction analyzed in this paper may seem to be a rather uncommon type of interaction, with the student participants, on the one hand, and the conversation partners, on the other, often never having met before, but nevertheless getting together and talking for an hour or more, ostensibly having no other business than providing opportunities for the student participants to practice and, hopefully, learn English. However, this type of interaction may not be as uncommon as it first appears. To give a few examples, many English-language schools, at least in the U.S., have programs similar to the conversation club; in so-called communicative language classrooms, much of the interaction among students or between students and the teacher may involve this sort of free conversation; and language learners themselves may organize meetings for the purpose of practicing their second language.

The purpose of the conversation club, according to the administration of the language school that sponsored it, was to provide students with opportunities to practice and learn English conversation. However, understanding what actually happens in the interaction at the conversation club, or in similar contexts such as those listed in the previous paragraph, and understanding how this interaction may (or may not) differ from “normal” conversation, requires research and careful analysis. This paper has demonstrated how a generic speaking practice, the establishment, explicitly or not, of the production format of what is spoken, is deployed in such interaction. The specific interactional work that is accomplished through the use of different production formats in specific instances is varied and does not seem to be designed to meet particular constraints or exigencies of the conversation club. However, an understanding of the interactional work that is accomplished in specific instances with this generic speaking practice provides a foundation for understanding how particular identities, identities which do seem to be closely related to the context of the conversation club, can be invoked and locally constituted during and through interaction.

References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson 1978. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Clayman, Steven E. 1992. Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news-interview discourse, in: P. Drew and J. Heritage, eds. *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 163-198
- Goffman, Erving 1967. *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books
- Goffman, Erving 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hauser, Eric 2003. 'Corrective recasts' and other-correction of language form in interaction among native and non-native speakers of English: The application of conversation analysis to second language acquisition. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa
- Heritage, John 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement, in: J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 299-345
- Mori, Junko 2003. The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36: 143-184
- Pomerantz, Anita and B. J. Fehr 1997. Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices, in: T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 64-91
- Psathas, George 1995. *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. London: Sage Publications
- Sacks, Harvey 1992. *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell
- ten Have, Paul 1999. *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London : Sage Publications

Susanne Kjærbeck: Narratives in talk-in-interaction: organization and construction of cultural identities
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
45-57
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Susanne Kjærbeck and the Editors, 2005

Narratives in talk-in-interaction: organization and construction of cultural identities.

Susanne Kjærbeck

Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde, Denmark
susannek@ruc.dk

Abstract

This paper takes its point of departure in material which was established as part of the European research project INES, International Negotiations in Spanish: linguistic and cultural issues, in which researchers participated from the business school ESADE (Barcelona), Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, and Copenhagen Business School/Roskilde University. The objectives of the INES project were to study the language of negotiations as well as the cultural aspects of this activity type and of the international business community in Spain. The empirical part of the project is composed of focus groups, individual interviews, and simulated negotiations; all of the material was videotaped. In our focus group material, a salient communicative resource is the narrative. In this article, I want to look into the narratives used in the focus group interaction, and specifically within a culturally mixed group of business people operating in the Barcelona area.

In all the focus groups the language used was Spanish. Nine invited persons participated in culturally mixed group: DT from Sweden, IT supporter in an editorial; PC from Spain, manager in a consultant firm dealing with communication and PR; TH from New Zealand, manager in a bureau for translation; PD from Spain, department manager in RAC; JJ from Brazil, department manager in Nestle; LD from Russia, sales manager in a production company of building materials; CC from Italy, chief accountant in Pirelli; AC from Spain, engineer in a chromium-plating plant, JCB from Spain, sales manager in a production company of building materials. Moreover, a moderator of Spanish descent and two assistants were present. The topics of the focus group talk were, in accordance with the interests of the INES project, international negotiations and business in Spain.

I will focus on three aspects of the analyzed narratives: the organization of narratives; argumentational aspects, and the construction of identities.

Focus groups as a method for studying social organization

The objective of inviting a certain social or cultural group as participants in a focus group session is to get insight in the viewpoints and experiences of the specific group. At the same time, the conversation is meant to be 'focused', because the organizers have already decided the topics to be discussed. The moderator opens and closes topics, and he/she asks questions which should be

answered by the invited participants. But in spite of this management of the conversation, the method is seen as providing an extraordinary insight in the participants' knowledge, beliefs and motivations. The reason why focus groups are especially suited for giving this type of insight is the fact that they are performed as social interaction in the group, and through interaction the participants show each other and the research group how they structure and organize their social world (Hughes and Dumont, 1993). Nevertheless, it seems important to be aware of situational factors, which makes every interaction special – for example the local developments of the talk and the influence of the researchers in a specific situation.

In our case, the moderator was very conscious of making room for unregulated talk between the participants. This is particularly important when the idea is to use focus group data for studying cultural aspects. The focus group can only give access to the language and the concepts participants use to structure their social world, if they are given room to speak. Hughes and Dumont (1993: 776) see this method as a phenomenological approach to cultural analysis:

'In their reliance on social interaction, focus groups can also help researchers identify cultural knowledge that is shared among group members as well as to appreciate the range of different experiences individuals within a group may have. Each of these brings researchers closer to a phenomenological understanding of a cultural group'.

And in this search for the participants' perspective narratives seem to be a very useful communicative resource, as a sense making form which expresses the speaker's interpretation of events and experiences. In the extensive literature on narratives, it is shown how people make sense of their experiences through narratives (see Mishler, 1986; Polkinghorne, 1988; Bruner, 1990; Czarniawska, 1997 and 1998).

What is a narrative in talk-in-interaction?

Within the field of talk in interaction there is a wide literature on the analysis of conversational story-telling, I am here referring to the work carried out by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (e.g. Sacks 1974, 1992; Jefferson, 1978). This literature has focused on the special management of the turn taking system, which occurs in story-telling, on the sequential organization of the talk which precedes the story-telling and the talk which follows, and on the topical relation between the story eliciting talk, the story unit, and the subsequent talk

The interactional narratives in our material do have a series of features in common with the conversational story:

A story is articulated with ongoing talk. It must be 1: introduced into conversation, and 2: exited in such a way as to reengage or fit with other topical talk (Jefferson, 1978; Maynard 1988).

The story is a way of packaging or presenting the facts of one's own or another's/others' experience.

Story-telling is an interactional accomplishment, it is sequentially organized, and the recipients are an active part in the story-telling activity (Sacks, 1974; Jefferson, 1978)

Stories take more than one utterance at talk, and during the story-telling the primary speaker has the right and obligation to keep the turn until the completion of the story.

During the telling of a story the recipient(s) must: refrain from taking a turn except to make remarks demonstrating that the story is being followed and understood or asking questions that relate directly to what is being told; at the end of the telling, demonstrate understanding by for example making comments demonstrating that the story has been understood, or by undertaking to tell a next story (Polanyi, 1987; Sacks, 1974)

In the story there is a recognizable punch line, and very often a prototypical display of story completion, a return 'home' (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks, 1974 and 1992). After the completion of the story and if the recipient's talk is not produced, the teller can do different kinds of work in order to elicit participation from the recipient (can produce a secondary ending, an assessment, request the recipient's comment).

The relationship of a story to subsequent talk is negotiated between the teller and the recipients.

In my data, all the above mentioned features are shared, but what distinguishes the narratives, I have here, from the story (in CA-terms, this also counts for Polanyi and Quasthoff) are the following:

the telling of a general story, and not of a specific event. The narrative is presented as a personal experience which can be generalized, the repetitive experience which one can have over and over again.

following the general story, an opinion or moral is extracted from the story. This opinion segment seems to be a systematic element in the narrative, and this is what makes it an argumentational unit.

Based on action analysis, and due to the organizational systematicity of the narratives, 'narrative' is suggested as a denomination, which covers the whole package, including the three mentioned elements, and not just the general story, the stretch of talk which is completed with the production of the 'punch line' of the story (for the notion of 'punch line' see Sacks, 1992: vol II, pp.478-483). This implies that the element opinion/moral is treated as part of the unit, and not as "subsequent talk" as it usually is in the conversation analytic tradition, which focuses on the organization of turn-taking.

In the following, I will analyze two examples of narratives. First, I will analyze the organization of the narratives, and then I will look into the construction of cultural identities which takes place.

Organization of the narrative

The first narrative is produced by the Swedish person DT; it can be found in the transcript of narrative 1 in the appendix, line 6-30.

This narrative relates to previous viewpoints of the Russian, LD, and the New Zealander, TH, which sustain that cultural differences do not exist. The content of the narrative is anticipated by DT's objection 'don't don't tell me there are no cultural differences' in line 1, and by producing a

narrative, the speaker is here accounting for his disagreement. What follows is a narrative about cultural differences between Spanish and Swedish behavior when these groups go to a bar together.

Narrative 1:

The story entry device of this narrative is expressed in line 6-7: 'I don't know I know for example the Swedes who live here (.) that is not in negotiation but in general'. By initiating his turn with 'I don't know' DT formats his talk as a mitigated disagreement with the viewpoint expressed by LD in the previous turn. And by expressing his lack of knowledge, and in this case his lack of recognition, and contrasting it with an expression of knowledge 'I know for example the Swedes who live here...' the topic of 'the Swedes who live here' is introduced as a relevant topic to the previous talk. Moreover, through the formulation 'that is not in negotiation but in general' the introduced topic and the subsequent talk is related to the more general themes of the conversation, namely business negotiations and cultural differences. This entry device links the talk to be produced with other topical talk, but it does not project the story format as such. Different communicative activities and formats could follow this introduction.

The general story is produced in line 7-26, where the punch line is to be found in line 9: 'They don't even know how to pay because someone always gets ahead' and this punch line is extended and explained in line 11-15 'so so they think hey how generous right how good right and they don't understand'. This climax is reacted to by the recipients who laugh loudly and comment on the story in line 16-21. We have here a funny story. It is proposed as such by the speaker who highlights the funny part by displaying and explaining the cultural misunderstanding and by laughing himself in line 17-19.

After the punch line the teller DT continues the turn in the format of an assessment, but in reality he connects with the general story again, and continues the story in a very vivid way.

The consequences in the form of the opinion or moral of the general story follows in 28-30: 'so one way or the other you have you have you have to adapt (0.6) and (1.0) pay so to speak run and pay before all the others (0.5) to be on good terms (0.7) that is (0.6) it is it is very difficult to adapt to this because in addition you are not aware'.

The next narrative, narrative 2 in the appendix is produced by the Spanish person PC. PC's narrative is formatted as an answer to the moderator's question 'another difference', which is asked in the previous turn. The theme of the narrative is again misunderstandings in the intercultural encounter, specifically the role of the personal relationship in business.

Narrative 2:

PC's story entry device takes place in line 1-4: 'what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality (1.1) be it authentic or: or: a mask or invented so to speak (0.5) but hospitality in the sense that (0.5) eh::'. The story entry device highlights the theme of the story to be produced. It is not necessarily a story that follows, but in one way or the other the foreign managers' surprise of Spanish hospitality has to be explained, and that requires a longer stretch of talk. The story entry device is formatted as the first part of an answer to the question asked by the moderator in the previous turn and thereby it relates the subsequent talk the topic of the question.

The first part of the general story can be found in line 4-8: 'groups who come here you show up you fetch them you entertain them you this and that (0.7) if it is for two or three days (he laughs) it is something pom pom pom pom pom that is you treat them wonderfully'. The first part of the general story is followed by accounts for the explained behavior (line 8-14). And then, in line 15-18 the teller continues his general story, and produces so to speak the second part of it: 'I: well I have had many cases where thereafter they leave and they leave feeling kind of surprises right like (.) my God what people so they start something like writing letters (.) and they want sort of stay in contact (.) and they call and so on but well you are not really interested any more'. This second part of the general story is again followed by accounting (line 24-33), and by different kinds of participation from the recipients in the form of laughter and comments.

In line 35-38 the punch line of the general story is recycled again, in a very highlighted and entertaining way. This repetition was apparently elicited by the very loud laughter immediately before.

In line 46-50 a real story in the conversation analytical sense of the term is integrated into a long narrative. This new version of the point was probably also elicited by the loud and shared laughter of the recipients. It consists in the telling of a specific event, and here it exemplifies the general story which was produced and repeated immediately before: 'a while ago I had a group of managers here from different countries and mh: of course we did our utmost for them they came to Barcelona they wanted to know things see restaurants ..hh so we did our utmost for them (.) and afterwards the reply has been letters calls I don't know (.) I thought my God I cannot attend all'.

In line 50-59 we find a last recycling of the course of events of the stories already told. It is about another specific event, and it is framed as another concrete example of the general story. The point of the previously told stories is here repeated for the fourth time: 'I have eh: girls: from: eh: people from Japanese firms whom I met in Japan (0.5) maybe: 15 or 12 years ago (.) and they still write to me on me they write to me on my birthday they call me on my Saints day xx I don't know what they send me a photo from their wedding that is xxx like: hh.. it is enough but I I I cannot'.

In line 59-63 we find the opinion or moral of the total telling of the narrative: 'I really think in this we are we sin a little: (0.9) eh: I would not say we fake because when they are here we devote ourselves (0.7) but we devote ourselves eh: superficially and (hands: klap klap klap) to other things afterwards (.) that is you cannot devote yourself to to to: 500 persons (.) for a limited time yes (.) not for not for: ever'.

Construction of cultural identities

This culturally mixed group is characterized by a lot of negotiation between the participants about the involved identities. There is a constant negotiation about cultural commonality with reference to the shared experience as members of the international business environment in Spain, and at the same time a constant negotiation about cultural differences.

What is central in the narratives, in more analytical terms, is the suggested membership categories (mainly cultural groups) and their category bound activities and the positioning of the teller and the other participants in relation to the suggested categories or cultural groups. The negotiations about membership categories and positionings take place as well in the narratives as in the talk after the

narratives, where the other participants reject or accept the proposed categories and positionings. They can be supported, questioned, or explicitly challenged by the rest of the group.

Sacks, in his early work on membership categorization (1992) points to the existence and analysis of 'category-bound activities'. What is accomplished and emphasized by using the generic narrative form, is precisely the generalizability of the told experiences – the teller says: I have experienced this behaviour over and over again, and I believe this behaviour is bound to a certain cultural group. In the narratives analyzed, a certain kind of behavior is ascribed to the different cultural groups, e.g. 'the Swedes don't pay the bill when they go to a bar with Spaniards' or 'the Spaniards are great hosts, but they do not understand the personalization of the business contact as a sign of personal friendship, as the foreign business people do'.

In the narratives, the recipients' reactions after the completion of the narrative, show how they treat the proposed culturally generalizable experiences. At this place, next speakers question or support the proposed categorization of activities. In the first narrative, their objections imply that the cultural generalizability proposed by DT is not possible. In the next turn CC, an Italian business man says: " a mí me pasó esto en Suecia (.)", This happened to me in Sweden!! Thereby completely rejecting the DT's interpretation.

In the case of PC's narrative, the moral focuses on the theme of making friends, the social phenomenon of 'amiguismo' in Spain, and how this behavior causes misunderstandings in the intercultural meeting between managers. The question which is highlighted is: are we (the Spaniards) true or false friends, and the speaker concludes that to some extent the Spanish behavior is a false one. The next speakers connect to this question, and in doing this, they continue using the suggested membership categories Spaniards/foreigners and the positioning of the groups is to a large degree accepted - most explicitly by the Spaniards.

However, the construction of cultural identity seems to take place on two levels. On one level, the participants debate and verbalize explicitly their experiences with regard to different cultural groups. On the other level of the talk, they use more subtle forms of communication, such as laugh tokens and other kinds of micro level procedures/resources, thereby positioning themselves in relation to the ongoing talk and in relation to the other participants. These two levels of identity construction, seem to consist of complementary and highly coordinated procedures for interpersonal construction of identity.

Zimmerman (1998) works with three types of identities, which integrates identity construction on different levels of talk in accordance with the local moment-by-moment organization of interaction: 'Discourse identities' are assumed as participants engage in sequentially organized activities such as: story teller, story recipient, questioner, answerer. 'Situated identities' are 'brought into being and sustained by participants engaging in activities and respecting agendas that display an orientation to, and an alignment of, particular identity sets', for example caller and call-taker. 'Transportable identities' which 'travel with individuals across situations and are potentially relevant in and for any situation and in and for any spate of interaction' (p. 90-91), could be any physical or culturally based visible indicators of identity, which are made relevant in the interaction. Zimmerman makes the point that also situational and transportable identities are constructed through micro-level procedures.

In DT's and PC's narratives, it would be difficult to differentiate situational identities from transportable identities. The participants are constantly making cultural identities of themselves and others relevant in the talk, they are constructing an intercultural encounter, just as they were asked to by the researchers. In that way they are at the same time constructing their situational identities as focus group participants or interviewees. And they are doing it through the communicative resources at the micro-level as the following:

1. The teller automatically reveals his or her relationship to the cultural groups of the narrative by giving linguistic form to it. In the case of the Swedish speaker, DT, he carefully marks himself as a person who has certain insights and who does not identify with neither the Swedes nor the Spaniards of the narrative: 'I know for example the Swedes who live here ... they meet with Spaniards and ...' (line 6-7). He positions himself as a borderline member, he tends to see himself as a cultural mediator.

In the case of the Spanish speaker, PC, he does not position himself outside the established membership groups, on the contrary, he includes himself in the Spanish group of the narrative: 'what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality' (line 1-2).

2. Laughter under the production of the narrative is another method for showing alignment or disalignment with the cultural groups being presented, and with the participating persons of the conversation.

In the case of the Spanish speaker, PC, the narrative is told from a Spanish perspective, and the Spanish contingent of the group finds the laughable peaks of the narrative very amusing, and they laugh very loudly, while the foreigners of the group, for example the Swede DT who plays an active part in the beginning, does not participate in the laughter as the telling recycles and the laughables tend to be more at the expense of the 'foreigners' of the narrative. In relation to line 38 where PC says 'and they think something like I have a friend in Spain and no it's a lie they have nothing', DT does not participate in the laughter, he does not react at all. It is not a unambiguous interpretation though, because another foreigner, the Russian business man, does participate with a long, braying laughter. But it obviously does not have the same heartfelt and intense quality as the laughter of the Spanish recipients. In the case of PC's narrative, he as a teller marks the Spanish group of the talk as an ingroup and the foreign group as an outgroup, the laughter in the beginning of the unit indicates alignment across the cultural backgrounds of the participants, but as the narrative develops, alignment predominantly occurs between the Spanish participants. Similar phenomena can be found in DT's narrative, and in other narratives of the material.

Interactional narratives as an argumentational resource

As an argumentational resource the narrative seems to be especially important to the debate of the group. In the focus group setting, it is characteristic that the participants try to reach agreement about the issues under debate (Myers, 1998), and the narrative seems to be decisive as a tool for coordinating or aligning the different opinions and experiences of the participants. Because it contains a whole package, it offers a sort of connection or link between experiences, opinions and frames of understanding, and the narrative sets the agenda of the talk for a long time. And because a specific frame of understanding is proposed in this format, it does much more work than a simple statement.

Conclusion

In this paper I have looked into narratives found in focus group talk between nine business people of mixed cultural background, and tried to show my observations on two examples of interactional narratives. My main conclusions are the following:

Organization of the narrative as argumentational unit

It is suggested that the narrative is a unit, which contains a story entry device, a general story which presents the teller's repetitive experience, and an opinion or a moral, which is extracted from the general story.

As for stories, the interactional narrative is a collaborative production in which the teller and the recipients play an active part, but what differentiates the interactional narrative from a conversational story is the generalizability of the narrated experience and its integration into an argumentational unit.

The general story of the unit functions as evidence for the proposition, which is expressed as an opinion or a moral. In the case of the first narrative, the whole unit moreover functions as an account for a previously uttered disagreement.

Due to fact that the general story indicates personal experience, it cannot be questioned or rejected. What can be questioned in the following turns is the acceptability of the proposed opinion or moral and its generalizability of the told activities.

Identity aspects of the narrative

Identity is an issue which is constantly negotiated in this talk. The participants express explicitly their experiences and definitions of relevant cultural groups, thereby positioning themselves and the other participants in relation to the proposed identity groups. But the recipients of the narratives are also doing identity work, through the construction of alignment and disalignment in the talk – be it during the telling of the narrative or in their reactions to it after the narrative is completed. In the narratives analyzed, the respective cultural backgrounds of the participants are clearly reflected in their ways of contributing to the construction of discourse identities and transportable/cultural identities.

An interesting question is: To which extent can we speak of specific narrative methods for constructing identities? I believe that the micro level resources I have mentioned in the analysis can all be used in other communicative forms than the narrative. But the narrative format seems to be especially fitted for expressing temporal order and plot, and generic narratives are especially fitted for presenting category-bound activities, for example in relation to cultural categories.

Without doubt, narratives are an important communicative resource for organizing the world and its experiences for the participating group of international business people. But in relation to the cultural categorizations which take place in narratives, there seems to be a dilemma: we make sense by categorizing, but nobody likes to be categorized, at least not by cultural stereotypes – especially not if they are negative stereotypes.

Appendix

Narrative 1

DT: no no me digas que no hay diferencias culturales

don't don't tell me that there are no cultural differences

TH: ah bueno [no yo entendí otra casa tam]bién=

oh well no I understood it differently too

3. DT: [heh heh heh heh]

heh heh heh heh

4. LD: =de[pende de nivel de:] capa de: (0.8) ciudad (0.6)

it depends on:: social:: town

5. PD: social=

group

6. DT: =no sé yo sé por ejemplo los suecos que viven a↑quí, (.) o sea no para negociar

I don't know I know for example the Swedes who live here that is not in negotiation

7. pero en general, (0.5) se encuentran con españoles, y entonces van al ↑bar, (1.1)

but in general they meet with Spaniards and then they go to a bar

8. Y: ehm (0.7) y nunca pagan. (1.3) nunca pagan en el ↑bar, (.) no porque no quieran

AND: ehm and they never pay they never pay in a bar not because they don't want

9. pagar, porque (.) no saben ni cómo pa↑gar porque siempre se adelanta al↓guien.

to pay because they don't even know how to pay because someone always gets ahead

10. (): (0.7) huh huh [huh]

huh huh huh

11. DT: [entonces] entonces [creen huy] qué generosos ↑no? ((smiles))

then then they think hey how generous right

12. (): [hm m] ((cough))

hm m

13. DT: qué bien ↑no

how good right

14. LD: hmpf hhh.. hhh.. ((laughter))=

hmpf hhh.. hhh..

15. DT: =y no entienden y [y:]

and they don't understand and and:

16. LD: [yo ()] () [igual]

I () () the same

17. DT: [hah]

hah

18. (): [hhhhhhh]

hhhhhhh

19. DT: [hah hah]

hah hah

20. (): [hhhh] hhh..

hhhh hhh..

21. LD: no pagan [nada no]

they don't pay anything no

22. DT: [es horrible] porque entonces no sabes (.) cómo tienes que actuar. (0.8) no tienes

23. *it is terrible because then you don't know how to behave* *you don't have*
ni idea. (.) y no sabes tampoco porque la () la gente te está empezando a mirar
the slightest idea and nor do you know because people are beginning to dislike you
24. *↑mal*, (0.7) y te están considerando un *rác*ano, ((smiles)) (1.0)
and they consider you a slacker
25. (): hh.. heh [heh heh]
hh.. heh heh heh
26. DT: [y por *qué*] no paga nunca *↑ese*,
and why does that one never pay
27. JCB: hm hm ((cough)) (1.3)
hm hm
28. DT: entonces tienes tienes tienes de alguna forma que adaptarte (0.6) *Y* (1.0) pagar
so one way or another you have you have you have to adapt AND pay
29. digamos ir *corriendo* a pagar antes de todo el *↑mun↓do* (0.5) para quedar bien (0.7)
so to speak run and pay before all the others to be on good terms
30. o sea, (0.6) es es muy *difícil* adaptarse a *esto* porque además no se *nota*, (0.6)
that is it is very difficult to adapt to this because in addition you are not aware

Narrative 2

PC: yo lo que veo que les sorprende bastante a a: gente:: ejecutivos compañeros
what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers

extranjeros que vienen a España un poco creo que es nuestra hospitali↓dad.
from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality
(1.1) ya sea auténtica o: o: como máscara o fingida digamos. (0.5) pero
be it authentic or: or: as a mask or invented so to speak but
hospitalidad en el sentido de que, (0.5) eh:: grupos que vienen a↓*quí* *llegas*
hospitality in the sense that eh:: groups who come here you show up
los *acoges* los *sacas* los *traes* los *enseñas* los *diviertes*
you fetch them you take them out you bring them you show them you entertain them
los tal y tal? (0.7) si es para dos días o tres días eh hh.. [heh heh heh es algo] (.)
you this and that if it is for two or three days eh hh.. heh heh heh it is something

7. JCB: [hah hah hah hah]
hah hah hah hah

8. PC: pom pom pom pom *↑pom* o sea los tratas de maravilla porque realmente
pom pom pom pom pom that is you really treat them wonderfully
creo que nos sale del carácter si vienen aquí (0.7) [un]
I really think this is our character if they come here

10. DT: [hm] ((cough))
hm

11. PC: poco *pasear*los *enseñar*les yo creo que nos gusta además nos divierte a nosotros
take them out a little show them furthermore I think we like it we are entertained

12. [Y:]

AND:

13. DT: [hay *un*] orgullo de [ser de ↓*aquí* de enseñarles]
there is a pride of being from here of showing them

14. las cosas=

the things

15. PC: =claro y yo: pues he tenido muchos casos de que luego se van y se van como
of course and I: well I have had many cases where thereafter they leave and they leave
16. sorprendidos no, como (.) Dios mío que gente entonces empiezan como escribir cartas
feeling kind of surprised right like my God what people so they start something like writing letters
17. (.) y *quieren como mantener el contacto* (.) y *llaman y tal pero bueno y tú como que*
and they want sort of stay in contact and they call and so on but well and you
18. *ya no estás interesado.* (.)
and you are not really interested any more
19. LD: *heh heh* [heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh heh heh
20. DT: [hah hah hah hah]
hah hah hah hah
21. AC: [hah hah hah hah hhah] [hah hah]
hah hah hah hah hhah hah hah
22. PC: [tengo que]
I have to
23. AC: hah hah hah ()=
hah hah hah
24. PC: =exacto ya los he pa↓sea↑do y se han ↓i↑do
exactly I have already taken them out and they are gone
25. DT: cumplido=
done
26. PC: =mira ya [vien]
look others
27. DT: [()] te escriben
() they write to you
28. PC: exacto vienen otro[s, dentro de dos sema↑nas]
exactly others come already within two weeks
29. D: [hhihh hihh hihh ..hh]
hihh hihh hihh ..hh
30. AC: [heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh
31. PC: no estoy para atender a todo el mundo o↓ye, [ya ya se]
I cannot attend to the whole world listen they should already already
32. D: [hihh hihh hihh]
hihh hihh hihh
33. PC: pueden dar por contentos
be satisfied
34. AC: hehh hehhh hehh hehh [hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh]
hehh hehhh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh
35. PC: [los pobres quedan como agrade]ci[dos no]
the poor creatures fell sort of grateful right
36. LD: [hehh] hehh hehh
hehh hehh hehh
37. [hehh]
hehh

38. PC: [y cre]en como tengo un amigo en España y no no mentira no tienen [nada ()]
and they think something like I have a friend in Spain and no no it's a lie they have
nothing ()
39. LD: °*[heh heh heh heh heh hh]*°
hah hah hah hah hah hah
40. (): [hah hah hah hh.. hh.]
hah hah hah hah hah
41. AC: [hah hah hah hah hah hah]¹
hah hah hah hah hah hah
42. PC: pero
but
43. LD: ..hh
..hh
44. PC: (es [un poco por esto) () (.) () no]
it is somehow due to this () () right
45. LD: [heh heh heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh heh
46. PC: que hace poco he tenido aquí un grupo de ejecutivos de varios pa↑íses y
a while ago I had a group here of managers from different countries and
47. mh: claro nos hemos desvivido por ellos venían a Barcelona querían conocer
mh: of course we did our utmost for them they came to Barcelona they wanted to know
48. cosas querían ver restaurantes ..hh bien como que nos hemos desvivido por ellos (.)
things they wanted to see restaurants ..hh so we did our utmost for them
49. luego la respuesta ha sido de cArtas llamAdas no sé qué (.) yo pensaba Dios mío
and afterwards the reply has been letters calls I don't know what I thought my God
50. no puedo atenderlos a todos o sea y eso mh: me ha pasado es la: ten↑go (.) eh:
I can't attend all in other words and this mh: happened to me it is the I have eh:
51. chicas: de: eh: gente de empresas japonesas que conocí en Ja↑pón (0.5) hace como:
girls from eh people from Japanese firms whom I met in Japan maybe:
52. 15 años, o doce años, (.) y aún me escriben por mi por me me escriben por mi
15 or 12 years ago and they still write to me on me me they write to me on my
53. cumpleaños me lla[man por mi santo: () no sé qué me mandan una foto de la boda]
birthday they call me on my saint's day () I don't know they send me a photo from their wedding
54. AC: [hh.. hah hah hah hah hah hah hah]
hh.. hah hah hah hah hah hah hah
55. PC: o sea [() como:]
that is () like
56. (): [heh heh]
heh heh
57. PC: hh.. ya pero
hh.. it is enough but
58. (): huh huh [huh]
huh huh huh
59. PC: [n n] n:: no puedo, o sea realmente yo creo que en esto somos pecamos un
I I I cannot that is I really think in this we are we sin a

¹ In these lines, we have here massive laughter and it is impossible to differentiate all the voices. The video camera only covers some of the participants.

60. *poco de: (0.9) eh: no diría de falsos porque cuando están aquí nos damos, (0.7) pero*
 little eh: I would not say we fake because when they are here we devote ourselves but
61. *nos damos eh: superficialmente y klap klap klap ((with hands)) a otra cosa después (.)*
 we devote ourselves eh: superficially and klap klap klap to other things afterwards
62. *o sea no puedes darte a a a: 500 personas (.) por un período de tiempo limi↑ta↓do sí,*
 that is you cannot devote yourself to to to: 500 persons for a limited time yes
63. *(.) no por el: resto del tiempo*
 not for not for ever

Transcript notation

[xxx]	overlapping utterances
= =	adjacent utterances are latched, no interval between them
<u>xxx</u>	emphasis
°xxx°	quieter than the surrounding talk
↓ ↑	marked rising and falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
xxx	creaking voice
And	capitals mark extra volume
((laughs))	double parentheses: descriptions of phenomena which could not be registered in detail

References

- Asmuss, Birte and Kjærbeck, Susanne (forthcoming). Negotiating meaning in narratives: an investigation of the interactional construction of punchline and the post-punchline sequence. *Narrative Inquiry*.
- Hester, Stephen and Peter Eglin, eds. 1997. *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hughes, Diane and Kimberley DuMont 1993. Using Focus Groups to Facilitate Culturally Anchored Research. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 21:6, 775-807.
- Jefferson, Gail 1978. Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation, in Jim Schenkein, ed. *Studies in the organization of conversation*, 219-248.
- Jefferson, Gail 1985. An Exercise in the Transcription and Analysis of Laughter, in T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* 3, 25-34.
- Jefferson, Gail 1988. On the sequential Organization of Troubles-talk in Ordinary Conversation. *Social Problems* 35:4, 418-441.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne 2004. Historiefortælling i mundtlig kommunikation. Modtageren som medfortæller, in Susanne Kjærbeck, *Historiefortælling i praktisk kommunikation*. København: Samfundslitteratur, 141-170.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne 2001. "Nosotros los españoles" y "los de afuera": Un estudio de focus group sobre la identidad cultural y la formación de opinion. *Discurso y Sociedad* 3:1.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky 1966. Narrative analysis: oral version of personal experience, in June Helm, ed. *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 12-44
- Maynard, Douglas 1988. Narratives and Narrative Structure in Plea Bargaining. *Law & Society Review* 22:3, 449-481.
- Myers, Greg 1998. Displaying opinions: Topics and disagreement in focus groups. *Language in Society* 27, 85-111.
- Polanyi, Livia 1985. Conversational Storytelling. In T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* 3, 183-201.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sacks, Harvey 1974. Analysis of the course of a joke's telling, in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer, eds. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 110-125.
- Sacks, Harvey 1992. *Lectures on Conversation* 1-2. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey 1972. On the Analyzability of Stories by Children, in John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York, 325-345.
- Zimmerman, Don H. 1998. Identity, Context and Interaction, in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe, eds. *Identities in Talk*. Sage, 87-106.

Paul McIlvenny and Pirkko Raudaskoski: Figuring the transnational 'Child-to-be-adopted': The web as a virtual sociocultural contact zone for intercountry adoption
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
58-70
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Paul McIlvenny, Pirkko Raudaskoski and the Editors, 2005

Figuring the transnational 'Child-to-be-adopted': The web as a virtual sociocultural contact zone for intercountry adoption

Paul McIlvenny and Pirkko Raudaskoski

Centre for Discourse Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark
paul@hum.aau.dk

Abstract

This paper presents our research which is part of a larger project that explores how to track and understand the linguistic, discursive and sociocultural contact zones or networks brought about by intercountry adoption. Using mediated discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, membership categorisation analysis and interaction analysis, the project attempts to trace a host of discourses and contingent practices of care and kinship that are heterogeneously assembled to 'translate' a child (legally and/or willingly) from one familial 'place' or network in the world to another, crossing linguistic, sociocultural, racial, class and national boundaries in the process. We introduce in this paper our first observations of the discursive construction of the 'child-to-be-adopted' in the pre-adoption stage. We focus on the crucial role of the 'intimate public sphere' of the Internet from the parents' point-of-view, specifically their personal web pages and online diaries that anticipate the 'transnational' mobility of the 'waiting' or abandoned child in a faraway place.

Epigraph

"The pupils of the first grade were discussing a photo of a family. In the picture, the hair of the youngest boy was of a different colour than that of the rest of family. One of the boys in the class thought that the boy was adopted, to which a girl from the class said: 'I know everything about adoption because I am adopted.' 'What does adoption mean then?' the boy asked. 'It means', the girl answered, 'that a child does not grow in the mother's belly but in her heart.'" (a translation of a re-circulated story from an online guestbook of a Finnish adoption website)

Introduction

This paper presents our research which is part of a larger project that explores how to track and understand the linguistic, discursive and sociocultural contact zones or networks brought about by intercountry adoption. Using mediated discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, membership categorisation analysis and interaction analysis, the project attempts to trace a host of discourses and contingent practices of care and kinship that are heterogeneously assembled to 'translate' a child (legally and/or willingly) from one familial 'place' or network in the world to another, crossing linguistic, sociocultural, racial, class and national boundaries in the process. We introduce in this paper our first observations of the discursive construction

of the ‘child-to-be-adopted’ in the pre-adoption stage. We focus on the crucial role of the ‘intimate public sphere’ of the Internet from the parents’ point-of-view, specifically their personal web pages and online diaries that anticipate the ‘transnational’ mobility of the ‘waiting’ or abandoned child in a faraway place. As the quotation in the epigraph illustrates, we should be aware of the circulatory power and mobility of such discourses and their sometimes unpredictable effects — this time on the adopted child. The story by an adoptive parent entered onto an online guest book humorously shows the consequences for the adopted child of a particularly intensive mobilisation by adoptive parents of a sentimentalised discourse of adoption, one which can also be found in the pre-adoption stage. The adopted girl in the anecdotal narrative had taken literally the effusive origin stories, such as ‘you grew in my heart’, or the repeated promise or declaration by the adoptive parents(s), ‘I (will) love you in my heart (with all my heart)’, which are also found on adopters’ personal homepages.¹

Intercountry adoption

Intercountry adoption features regularly in the mass media, often spectacularly (as in the illegal cases where babies are traded across national borders as commodities for childless couples), yet the general public knows little about the processes and practices of this fairly recent phenomenon (since the 1950s). There are big differences in intercountry adoption practices across the Western countries (Selman 2000). In only a few receiving countries is adoption thoroughly regulated at all stages by the state. Denmark and Finland are comparable examples, though Finland has much fewer intercountry adoptions per year. The adoptive family is an intense site of inspection, an intersection of a whole range of medical, judicial, educational, psychological and linguistic practices. Through application procedures, social worker visits, obligatory courses, official adoption agencies and adoption associations, the child and the prospective adoptive parent(s) are discursively constructed in a variety of ways, for example as a ‘last resort’ (for the child and/or the adopter) or a ‘complete’ family unit (shifting with the move to legalise single and gay/lesbian adopters). Other countries, such as the USA, France and Germany have a much more liberalised ‘market’ with less state regulation, and so private sector agencies and lawyers flourish, resulting in quite different discourses that are often more legalistic, individualistic and parent-centred.

Research studies of intercountry adoption are increasingly common, but are predominantly from psychological, psycho-social or social welfare perspectives. Instead, we wish to promote a discourse studies approach that investigates how the social issues and discourses of adoption are mediated in the actions and practices of different actors, primarily of adoptive parents.

Discourse studies, mediated action and transnationality

Social and political theory has taken a decidedly ‘global’ turn in recent years, resulting in a sustained critique of conceptualisations of ‘society’ and the ‘nation-state’. Instead, social theorists ask us to refocus on, for example, transnationality, global orderings, hybrid

¹ However, in the preface to this circulated story, the author of the guestbook entry writes: “The old saying that ‘children always tell the truth’ seems to hold true here, too. Beautifully put, or what?” Thus, we can see that the sentimentalised discourse is so powerful that this reader/sender does not see the irony in it. The child’s misunderstanding reveals, in fact, the attempt by the adoptive parents to smooth over the perceived absence or loss of a biological origin narrative, yet they appeal to the equivalence of their ‘love’ to that based on cultural narratives of ‘blood ties’. There is a discrepancy between the adults’ metaphorical discourse and the child’s bodily understanding.

collectives, flows and mobilities, and networks. Given that discourse studies draws heavily upon social theory we are compelled to ask what new possibilities there are for discourse studies as a result of contemporary social and political theorising. We might query what the consequences are of taking seriously an emerging 'network sociality' for a discourse studies methodology. What can discourse analysis in its various forms provide for understanding events as mediated in, through and across talk, text and other modalities of discourse? How are we to describe and explain 'global events' as manifested in actual discursive practices? With the emergence of a new sociocultural order of globalisation, how can we refigure 'discourse' (and language) in relation to the post-national?

We are interested in pushing two methodologies we are familiar with — critical discourse analysis (CDA) and conversation analysis (CA) — in new directions to cope with the impact of globalisation, new media and the 'knowledge society'. Our lives are increasingly interconnected with actors of all scales across the planet, and these relationships are mediated in new ways that tend to deterritorialise communication and language. Moreover, we know this is happening, and our attempt to understand how and why reflexively shapes our interactions and practices in ways that are inimical to globalisation itself. No longer can we restrain ourselves to look at 'texts' as transmission containers for dominant ideologies without regard to their circulation and uptake. No longer can we examine the 'local ordering' of a single conversation when the participants themselves do not recognise the scale of 'local' (or 'micro') as wholly constitutive of their interactions. In fact, text and context, micro and macro, actor and structure, as well as local and global, are all problematic dualisms that often hinder our understanding of sociocultural ordering. Latour (1993, 1999) criticises the rock solid distinctions between nature/culture and society/technology that modernists have produced, but which do not bear scrutiny. When we investigate how we interact in and with the world, they are usually *not* found in such dualistic terms. Adoption is a case in which nature and culture, and kinship and belonging, are clearly problematised. Howell (1999) uses Latour's notion of 'hybridity' to elucidate how adoptive parents create cognitive boundaries between different contexts to attempt to insulate the conflicting discourses from each other, eg. the social versus biological accounts of origin and 'roots'.

Following mediated discourse analysis (Scollon 2001), we prefer to shift the focus to investigating mediated action, action that is always mediated in significant ways for the participants. Because discourses come to have certain effects when they are engaged in specific actions, we need to track just how social actors produce and interpret intelligible action in recognisable ways. We are, therefore, also concerned with exploring more intimately the relations between discourse and action, and between the discursive and the non-discursive, which have hitherto been ignored or under theorised. Scollon (2001: 158) is fundamentally concerned with "how the transformations from practice, action, and habitus to person, characteristics, and identity is performed through discursive practices and other practices of technologisation and objectivisation." We might compare his formulation to that of Foucault's: "it is one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires come to be identified and constituted as individuals" (1980: 60). Thus, in our approach the apparently fundamental relations that constitute our beliefs in identity, self and individuality are contingent, and thus just how they are articulated on each occasion is left open for investigation.

We also wish to expand our range of phenomena from written texts and spoken conversations to include multimodal discourse, spaces, materialities and artifacts. Agency is often distributed across a heterogeneous arrangement or collective, and thus it cannot be understood

from the perspective of only one type of 'text' or interactional encounter. Hence, we need not only a 'textography' (Swales 1998), but a 'media-ography', as well as a mapping of 'discourses in place' (Scollon & Scollon 2003).

Method

Following mediated discourse analysis, we wish to determine the active participants, mediational means, scenes, events and actions that matter for each nexus of practice. We are engaged in the beginnings of a 'multi-site' (or 'trans-site') ethnography (Marcus 1995, Hakken 1999), which follows the actants, the artefacts, the metaphors, the narratives, the life/biographies and the conflicts in and across multiple 'sites'. We need to determine which social issues and mediational means matter for participants and how actors appropriate mediational means in their mediated actions. For instance, we are interested in what sources of state or agency information and informal knowledges are circulated and appropriated on parental websites and discussion groups. Personal websites are also a means to identify member's generalisations and individual experiences.²

Since we are focusing at this stage on the Internet presence and online participation of adoptive parents, we are conducting what could be called a 'virtual' ethnography (Howard 2002, Hakken 1999, Hine 2000, Markham 1998 and Paccagnella 1997). This means we need to consider a range of methodological and ethical issues particular to this domain of social practice. It is difficult to uncover the practices of 'going online' when communication practices and mediated actions are de-contextualised, transient, distributed, asymmetric and mobile. Rather than selecting a territory, the researcher has to identify a 'virtual' community or nexus of practice and select the important nodes and nodal events in the social and discursive network.

Data collection

Initially, we follow the prospective adoptive parents as they navigate through the complex process of intercountry adoption, while simultaneously mapping the ways in which 'the child-to-be-adopted' is resemiotised up until first physical contact between the adoptive parents and the adoptive child.

We have identified that many prospective adopters use the Internet to garner information, advice and contacts to help them through the adoption process and the institutional procedures.³ Some adopters establish semi-permanent web sites, which can be quite extensive. Moreover, a few adopters become key actors in the creation and maintenance of a home-grown 'grassroots' adoption web portal (eg. 'Chinaadopt', Kinaadopt in Denmark) or a community forum and mailing list (eg. Yahoo groups). There are, of course, other possible websites that may interest pre-adopters: for example, the vital adoption agency websites, the official state websites, the statistical sources and the anti-adoption websites. At this stage we

² Some adoption researchers have also drawn upon websites in their analyses: Anagnost (2000), Cartwright (2003), and Shiu (2001).

³ Of course, access to the world-wide Internet is for a privileged few. We have no statistics on how many pre-adoptive parents in Denmark have access and use the Internet regularly. Given their status as adopters, and the provision of many resources online by the adoption agencies (eg. the waiting list), it is likely that most if not all have access and use it during the process of adoption. It is unlikely, however, that the birth mothers in the sending countries will have access (Harcourt 1999).

are more interested in how particular adopters construct their websites, network with others locally and internationally, orient to other sites or sources of information, share advice and create 'public goods', and narrate publicly their own personal experiences and problems with adopting their children. Moreover, as Sarangi & Slembrouck (1996: 18) argue, the public domain efficiently manages the needs and wants from the private domain. These needs and wants and how they are shaped through contact with the public domain are readable (as one type of reporting) in the web diaries.

We have collected a corpus of personal websites and online discussion forums from different receiving countries, and we are focusing on their relationship to particular donor countries from a comparative perspective. The receiving countries are Denmark, Finland, the USA, the UK, Canada and Australia. The donor countries include China, Korea, India and Columbia, which are the countries supplying the most number of intercountry adoptees. In our corpus, adoptive family websites are found predominantly in North America and Denmark, but are not so prevalent in the UK, Australia or Finland. Discussion forums are found in all receiving countries, though there are a number of international forums as well (usually in English).

Observation and analysis

The first set of analytical observations concerns how to describe some aspects of the sociotechnical 'networking' of parents as observed in their interactions and familial productions on the Internet. Also of interest is the global propagation and diffusion of discourses, genres and styles in these virtual nexus of practice. A further set of analytical observations focuses on the reflexive awareness different actors have of the ideological import of their language use in relation to adoption. The last section concerns how the child is figured in the narratives of the personal web pages and online diaries designed and authored by the prospective adoptive parents or the adoptive families.

The intimate public sphere and the technologisation of networks

The Internet offers a variety of forums for parents (and adoptees) to make contact with 'like-minded' people, with affiliations based on stage in the official process; chosen birth country, region or orphanage; adoption agency; category of family; category of adoptee and so on. Adoptive parents form both loose and tight networks to share experience, distribute knowledge (outside of the control of agencies/state) and form support groups, which to some extent are like communities of practice (Wenger 1998) that negotiate a virtual sociocultural contact zone. Personal websites, 'low-fi' web navigation software (search engines, web rings, weblogs) and online discussion forums afford new ways and transform traditional ways of building trust, creating 'public goods', distributing agency and awareness of presence across a complicated sociotechnical collective (see Wellman 2002, Rheingold 2002).⁴

It has been noted that the Internet makes possible an 'intimate public sphere' (Anagnost 2000; see Berlant 1997). One reason for the relatively intimate nature of the personal websites may derive from the intense scrutiny that the couple or single adopter have had to undergo as part of the institutionalised adoption process. This has inculcated both a more radical discursive reflection on their identity as a non-normative family, and a longing to be publicly

⁴ We can describe these techniques and tools as providing for 'centres of calculation' (Latour 1987) or 'portals of association', which network and mediate the calculation and testing of performative social bonds and alliances.

accountable as a family that copes with adoption. Even though they make up only one percent of families with children, they share in common with other pre-adoptive and adoptive parents the experience of the intrusive practices of the authorities. This may result in the desire to share that experience online (and offline) for the benefit of others.

Most of the web sites we have examined are authored by adoptive mothers. There is a noticeable absence of father(s) as autobiographical subjects (either in heterosexual couples or as single adopters) — except as they are included within the narrative ‘we’ (shifting between ‘I’ the mother to ‘we’ the parents) — though the father/husband may be working behind the scenes to create and maintain the website that features the archive and narrative of adoption. Many adoptive parents’ web sites contain a ‘maternal archive’ (Berlant 1997), a ‘museological mania’ (Kelly & Apter 1993: 352), that constitutes an imaginary archival ‘origin story’ ready to be accessed at some future date when the adopted child will undertake the self-reflection and questioning expected of an adoptee. Here we also find a technologisation, a hybridised convergence of the Internet economy with the prospective adopters — ‘the consuming family to be’.

On their websites, many adoptive parents create a bricolage of images, photographs, music, texts, documents, layouts, navigation systems and links, borrowing from here and there to create a semiotic aggregate (Lemke 2002, Scollon & Scollon 2003). The personal homepages and websites by the adoptive parents are constructed in ways that afford a variety of different usages (cp. Karlsson 2002), eg.

- 1) as a ‘maternal archive’ (Berlant 1997) for the child at some future date to ‘discover’ his or her ‘origins’;
- 2) as a ‘public good’, useful for other adoptive parents to ‘learn’ from;
- 3) as a resource for the author;
- 4) as a means to track in limited ways a social network or community of practice (eg. to link outside the website to other ‘waiting’ parents, webring, discussion forms).

Many adoptive parents design their web sites by drawing interdiscursively upon a design shell and/or a prefabricated iconology. Thus, this can tie them into chains of flexible economic exchange as carriers and transmitters of dual-use signifiers: their appropriation of the off-the-shelf iconology and software supplied by web providers insures the circulation of the product or brand amongst the community of users/browsers. Sometimes adoptive parents from non-English speaking countries appropriate CyberEnglish software (technologisation of genres). For example, adoptive parents from Denmark have created a website using the American CaringBridge website service (whose catchphrase is “Be There”), which they also publicised on an online discussion forum in Danish. In their provision of easy scripts for the creation of personal homepages (as virtual ‘lifebooks’ or ‘weblogs’) served from their website, not only does this software permit the technologisation and resemiotisation (Iedema 2001) of the ‘maternal archive’ (eg. journal history and photo collection), the software provider also seductively aims to provide a free social service for the parents and their larger social network, eg. “A free online service to keep friends and family - your caring community - in touch and informed during important life events, including medical treatment, childbirth or adoption” (<http://www.caringbridge.org>). We wonder how extensive is the appropriation and diffusion of ‘European American’ communicative and caring practices into other national contexts and hence into the practices of adoptive families both online and offline, eg. with self-help books, web-advice, therapy techniques, and so on (cp. Cameron 2000, 2002).

‘Positive adoption language’: contested language ideologies

Among adoptive parents (and adoptees), there is clearly an awareness of and a strong emotional response towards the inappropriate behaviour of people who have little understanding of adoption, ie. those who can hurt the feelings of adoptive parents and adoptees in everyday or institutional encounters. Common attitudes to adoption are usually stereotypical and normative, and are often drawn from the mass media. The parents signal their discomfort when they give advice on appropriate language usage, combined with anecdotal evidence of such encounters and guidance on how to solve ‘the problem’ or avoid the topic or encounter altogether. Hence, parents are cognisant of the tactical importance of language in shaping sociocultural responses and actions. If one wishes to effect social change, then one strategy is to initiate a shift in the everyday use of concepts (mediational means), such that certain actions become thinkable, and thus doable, while others become unthinkable. Sometimes known facetiously as ‘political correctness’, Fairclough (2003: 22) calls this a process of cultural and discursive intervention, which “attempts to change discourses on the assumption that changing discourses will, or may, lead to changes in other elements of social practices through processes of dialectical internalisation.”

Many US American adoption support websites give practical, constructive advice on specific vocabulary and phrases to use that avoid what they see as the negative associations that adoption has in English. Unfortunately, in their recommendations to condone a particular usage on the grounds that it is offensive to adoptive parents and their families, the highly contested politics of adoption is often elided. The practice of attending to politically correct language usage is often termed “Respectful Adoption Language” or something similar by adopters. The advice is often given in the form of a two column list of appropriate and inappropriate language: SAY THIS, DON’T SAY THAT. The items on the list are visually presented in a left and right column: the left signifying the appropriate term or phrase, and the right the problematic word or phrase. The list constitutes a classificatory schema (structured as a set of binary categories) that attempts to ‘de-biologise’ the origins of the child, diminish the role of the ‘birth’ mother/culture, or reduce the importance of ‘adoption’ as an ontological descriptive modifier. Examples include:

- (1) ‘birth parent’, but not ‘real parent’;
- (2) ‘genetic relative’, but not ‘blood relative’;
- (3) ‘our child (by adoption)’, but not ‘our adopted child’;
- (4) ‘adoption circle’, but not ‘adoption triad’;
- (5) ‘was adopted’, but not ‘is adopted’.

Another example, which is intended to emphasize ‘choice’ and agency, recommends that it is inappropriate to say that the ‘birth’ mother ‘places a child for adoption’ or ‘gives a child away’, but that she ‘makes an adoption plan’ for the child. One of the implications is that the mother in the sending country is relinquishing the child freely.

On some websites anecdotal evidence is given that reconstructs a particular everyday conversational encounter in which the adoptive parent is insulted, hurt or otherwise offended. The examples aim to illustrate the insensitivity of the interlocutor upon hearing the news of the adoption plans or in the presence of an adopted child. For instance, here is one case of a reported conversation narrated (and fictionalised) by a member of an Internet bulletin board on adoption:

Q: “What’s her mother’s name?”

A: "My name is Lisa."

Q: "No, I mean her real mother's name."

A: "I'm her mother."

Q: "NO, I mean her real mother."

A: "What do you think I am? Polyester?"

And then, as if I must be some sort of an idiot, I said, "Ohhhh you mean her birthmother!"

Q: Then she said, "Well you knew what I meant all the time."

A: "No I didn't. I'm her real mother and I always will be. What do you think Sara will go through if she heard u say that I'm not her real mother and she is too young to understand?"
(excerpted from Johnston 2001)

This example illustrates an orientation by the adoptive mother (A) to inappropriate questioning and categorisation by her interlocutor (Q). Rather than explicitly correct the assumptions that Q makes in her question (eg. that the child has a 'real' mother who is not present and who has a name that is known to A), A uses a multi-turn discursive strategy to frustrate and thus educate an ignorant interlocutor. On the one hand, Q is engaged in repairing (third turn repair) what she hears as A's misunderstanding of her original question "What's her mother's name?". On the other hand, A is 'performing' a mock misunderstanding of the reference of the question. In fact, she is overdoing an implicit other-initiated, other-repair (ending with her insincere recognition of the trouble source: "Ohhhh you mean her birthmother!"). This results in Q realising that the misunderstanding is intended, and that the term 'real mother' is an insensitive way of referring to the 'birth mother', yet she appeals to the reasonableness of her original question in the circumstances. A denies this and then delivers with a distinctly moral tone an indignant account of her 'realness' as a mother.

Another example (from Johnston 2001) illustrates a similar scenario, told second-hand, but one in which the offending person apparently should have known better because of their category-bound professional expertise and sensitivity.

Friends of mine adopted, and shortly after adopting the husband was telling a client about it and the client asked, "Oh, well how much did she cost you?" No this was not a blundering idiot like most, but a social worker!

In this case, alternative interpretations are possible that undercut the complaint against this person rather than make him or her a more extreme case who should have known better (the exception that always proves the rule). For instance, it may have been exactly because s/he was a social worker, and hence such a categorisation as a professional (not a client) can be heard as implicating s/he knows about the process/costs, that s/he has a right (more than an average citizen/friend has) to take this issue up in such a fashion, as a matter-of-fact way of inquiring about the process.

On the web, an alternative source of advice can be found that aims to contest and subvert the common ways in which language (for instance, the parental discourse of adoption) maintains a particular pro-adoption ideology that elides actors, and deletes or subsumes agency. It is to be found on some English language adoptee web sites, such as those of Bastard Nation and Trans-Racial Abduction. One web site reproachfully calls the naturalised pro-adoption discourse 'Adoption-Speak'. For example, targets for change are 'adoption', 'adoptee', 'birth mother', 'best interests', 'adoption plan' and 'as if'. These websites are clearly deliberately antagonistic towards the pro-adoption websites mentioned above.

The next stage of our study will be to monitor how different actors attend to or disattend an ‘adoption ideology’ in a variety of discursive (and non-discursive) practices, such as everyday conversation with family or friends, social worker visits, online discussion forums, preparation course group work and autobiographical narratives.

How is the ‘child-to-be’ figured and categorised?

The last set of analytical observations focuses on how the child is figured in different discourses in the narratives and intertextuality of the personal web pages and online diaries designed and authored by the prospective adoptive parents or the adoptive families. The online diaries can be regarded as a mediational means to claim public trustworthiness. In other words, if a couple keeps a public diary about their adoption process, it is in a way claiming that they have ‘nothing to hide’.⁵ In contrast, the information that the client gives in a bureaucratic process is usually not accepted at face value by the institution — clients are presumed to be ‘uncooperative’ and their contributions are open to scrutiny (see Sarangi & Slembrouck 1996: 47).

In the Scandinavian adoption sites scrutinised for this study, the absence of the word ‘child’ is remarkable. It is only when the desired child is talked about in relation to adoption that people write specifically about ‘a child’ or even ‘our child’. For example,

- (1) ‘with certainty there would come a child, after a long time with uncertain IVF treatments’ (“der med sikkerhed ville komme et barn, ovenpå den lange tid med usikre IVF-behandlinger”), (from ‘Carmen and Jakob’s web diary’⁶ in which they discuss adoption vs. fertility treatments);
- (2) ‘our future child might not come from the Saanxi province’ (“tuleva lapsemme ei ehkä ole Saanxin maakunnasta”), (‘Samppa’ in a diary entry anticipating a trip to China, the donor country);
- (3) ‘adoption permission for one child’ (“adoptiolupa yhdelle lapselle”), (from ‘Samppa’s’ diary entry about the institutional decision for a permission to adopt);
- (4) and finally, ‘it is far and foremost a child one wishes for oneself’ (“man ønsker sig jo først og fremmest et barn”), (from ‘Carmen and Jakob’s’ adoption diary when the wish-for-a-child is talked about at a general level).

Also, reference to a ‘child’ appears often in descriptions about what the adoption agencies do. For instance, they ‘mediate children’ (“formidler born”), or there is a ‘child in referral’ (“barn i forslag”).

The status of web diaries as a source for information and knowledge to other adoptive parents, and not just as ‘notes for oneself’ becomes clear in, for instance, the following quote from ‘Carmen and Jakob’s’ web diary: ‘If one gets problems with one’s child, AD is quite definitely a good and competent councillor.’ (“Hvis man får problemer med sit barn er AD helt sikkert en god og kompetent rådgiver.”) So, instead of ‘if we get problems with our child’, a generic, instructive tone is used. The question then becomes: Is the instructive tone used to avoid talking about ‘my/our child’, and, instead, to talk about ‘one’ and ‘one’s child’,

⁵ The Finnish websites in the corpus are deliberately anonymised, except for one Finnish-Swedish family website. Thus, in these cases the adoption process itself, and not the individual adopter, becomes accentuated.

⁶ Although the adoption websites are in the public domain, accessible to anyone over the Internet, we have made our examples anonymous by changing names.

or: Does the instructive mode offer a possibility to talk about ‘one’s child’, even if not intimately?

But when Carmen and Jakob report on somebody else talking about their future child, the word ‘child’ is used to talk about ‘us’ and the emotional connection: ‘The social worker of our case in the Copenhagen Municipality rang and told us that it would unfortunately not be her who would bring us the happy news about a child, because she would stop working.’ (“Vores sagsbehandler i Københavns Kommune ringede og fortalte, at det desværre ikke ville blive hende, der skulle overbringe os den glædelige nyhed om et barn, da hun skulle holde op.”) The care taken to avoid talking about ‘our child’ continues even when the couple announces that there is a child waiting for them — it is done first with the official formulation ‘we received a child-in-referral’ (“vi fik barn i forslag”), and then it is formulated through membership in a group: ‘we would be among those who got a child’ (“vi ville være blandt dem der fik barn”).

Hence, the authors of these Finnish and Danish web diaries seem to avoid talking about ‘our child’, and even the word ‘child’ only appears in connection with (often pre-formulaic) ‘adoption talk’, or when the adoptive parents instruct others on possible problems with an adopted child, or when they report on others talking about their child-to-be, or when they talk about themselves as members of a bigger group that adopts.

Although adoption diaries are still a fairly new and rare example of the intimate public sphere, it is pertinent to compare them to online pregnancy diaries (see Madge & O’Connor 2002). The Finnish adoption web site quoted above was especially interesting because the woman became pregnant after around two years in the adoption process (this sometimes happens and the adoption process is legally terminated). She then started a pregnancy diary on the same site. This new diary gives a possibility for us to compare how the future biological child is discursively constructed in pregnancy diaries with how adopted children are constructed in adoption diaries. As was the case in other Finnish and Danish data (personal web pages) it was typical that the words ‘child’, ‘baby’ or ‘fetus’ were not used explicitly, and especially not in the formulation ‘our child/baby’. Nevertheless, reference to the bureaucratic process ‘adoption’ as a term entails ‘child’, and therefore makes it possible for the website author not to mention the ‘virtual child’, who possibly has already been born in the faraway donor country. In the same way, the term ‘pregnancy’ or the expression ‘being pregnant’ makes it possible not to refer to a ‘child’ or a ‘baby’, or a ‘fetus’.

The pregnant woman in Finland, ‘Santtu’, calls her site ‘Santtu’s adoption and baby pages’, thus contrasting ‘adoption’ with (biological) ‘baby’. As in the adoption diaries analysed earlier, there is no mention of ‘child’, ‘baby’, or ‘fetus’, in this diary. The first reference to the fetus is a link to an ultrasound picture: “the first ultra”. Then the child can be talked about as parts — ‘the hands were clearly visible’ — or, especially, as a heart beat (taken as evidence that there is something there that is alive). The first reference to the fetus is by the humorous term “the Minnow”, a metaphorical expression which later was changed into a nickname (with capital letter and the quotation marks dropped). ‘Baby’ appears for the first time in connection with the buying of used baby clothing, i.e. not about the specific baby that is expected. The last ultrasound pictures mentioned were taken officially (at some specific point in the pregnancy, unlike many of the ones she had taken in a private clinic just to get a ‘picture’), and among them was a ‘profile’. Now the category ‘boy’ (to refer to the gender — could also mean ‘son’ in Finnish) is used: Minnow’s gender was ‘revealed’ in these pictures.

Still, at the end of the diary, Minnow is not talked about as ‘our Minnow’ — the humorous distance to the unborn is kept linguistically.

Therefore, we can see that both adoptive and biological parents appear to avoid talking directly about a/their ‘child’ or ‘fetus’. One way of interpreting this lack of explicit linguistic reference is that the waiting parent(s) do not want to ‘claim’ the child before physical contact with the child. In the Finnish adoption diary, however, there is a change after she learns she is pregnant. She now describes their plans a month earlier to travel to the donor country ‘to get our little girl or boy’. In addition, she writes in the pregnancy diary: ‘our adopted child from China’. When the adoption process is over, it seems to be easier to talk about ‘our (adopted) child’.

In contrast, it appears that pre-adopters on some of the US American sites have no problem claiming the child as theirs. Indeed, one class of US American adoptive parents’ websites prefigure the ‘waiting child’ even before the referral of a specific child (accompanied by the medical records and the photograph(s) of the child). Adoptive-parents-to-be construct a schematic, generic web design to be filled at the appropriate time with details of the significant next event, such as the referral photo, the acceptance, the trip and the physical contact.⁷ For instance, one website includes a caption “referral photo to go here” to accompany an empty picture frame. These website diaries also indicate that naming the child is an important decision at this early stage for the parents-to-be, as is their preparation of the ‘home’ (through consumption) for the much anticipated arrival of the ‘waiting child’.⁸ This may reflect the differences in the adoption process, which in the USA is an individual, legal issue, but in Scandinavia the ethics of the process are accentuated in official discourses and courses, in which the future adoptive parents are encouraged to some extent to see the whole process from the child’s — and not only their own — perspective.

Even if the Scandinavian parents would not linguistically talk about ‘their child/baby’, they were, anyway, keen to ‘foresee’ or imagine the forthcoming addition to their family — to visualise as well as gather scraps of information or ‘data’ about the infant and its pre-history. Visualisation of the fetus — the biological child — is possible through ultrasound. For adopted children we can envisage an analogous ‘scan’ or resemiotisation composed of an assemblage of evidence, for instance referral photos, photos of adopted children from that country, medical records, statistical records, and so on. Thus, with adoption we could talk about low frequency or ‘low fi’ scanning; that is, picking information from here and there, which is thoroughly a heterogeneous assemblage of ‘culture’, ‘nature’ and ‘technology’.

Conclusion

Further studies will investigate how adopters integrate their online practices — browsing, building a web presence and taking part in networks and discussion forums on the Internet — with how they manage their domestic life, their contacts with the authorities and strangers, their participation in adoption preparation courses, and their ongoing disclosure of their adoptive status (to kin, friends, colleagues and strangers). We are also interested in how these

⁷ See Cartwright (2003) and Telfer (1999) for extensive analyses of parents’ use of the referral photographs they receive from the agency.

⁸ We might also ask why these pre-adopters, in their eagerness to adopt as soon as permissible, have occupied their time in website building. Is this a middle-class preoccupation in a risk society?

practices mediate and assemble their lifeworld of adoption as nexus of practice, as well as construct and circulate sociocultural knowledge about the appropriate forms of adoptive relations.

If we better understand how prospective adopters formally and informally navigate the 'linguascapes' of adoption texts, media, rules, institutions and practices, we may be better able to recommend how to develop participatory adoptive parenting courses, to promote empowering public adoption discourses and to provide timely online resources for facilitating the parents' decision-making about transnational adoption and their adoptive practices within an ongoing ethical, child-centred policy.

References

- Anagnost, Ann 2000. Scenes of misrecognition: Maternal citizenship in the age of transnational adoption. *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 8(2):389-421
- Berlant, Lawrence 1997. *The queen of America goes to Washington city: Essays on sex and citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Cameron, Deborah 2000. *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture*. London: Sage
- Cameron, Deborah 2002. Globalization and the teaching of 'communication skills', in: D. Block and D. Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, London: Routledge
- Cartwright, Lisa 2003. Photographs of 'waiting children': The transnational adoption market. *Social Text* 21(1):84-109
- Fairclough, Norman 2003. 'Political correctness': The politics of culture and language. *Discourse & Society* 14(1):17-28
- Foucault, Michel 1980. Truth and power, in: C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, Brighton: Harvester
- Hakken, David 1999. *Cyborgs@cyberspace: An ethnographer looks to the future*. London: Routledge
- Harcourt, Wendy (ed.) 1999. *Women@Internet: Creating new cultures in cyberspace*. London: Zed Books
- Hine, Christine 2000. *Virtual ethnography*. London: Sage
- Howard, Philip N. 2002. Network ethnography and the hypermedia organization: New media, new organizations, new methods. *New Media & Society* 4(4):550-574
- Howell, Signe Lise 1999. Biologizing and de-biologizing kinship: Some paradoxes in Norwegian transnational adoption, in: A.-L. Rygvold, M. Dalen and B. Sætersdal (eds.), *Mine - yours - ours and theirs: Adoption, changing kinship and family patterns*, Oslo: Department of Special Needs, University of Oslo
- Iedema, Rick 2001. Resemiotization. *Semiotica* 137(1/4):23-29
- Johnston, Patricia Irwin 2001. *Adoption is a family affair! What relatives and friends must know*. Indianapolis, IN: Perspective Press
- Karlsson, Anna-Malin 2002. Web literacy, web literacies or just literacies on the web? Reflections from a study of personal homepages. *The Reading Matrix* 2(2). [Online]
Available: <<http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/karlsson/index.html>>
- Kelly, Mary and Apter, Emily 1993. The smell of money: Mary Kelly in conversation with Emily Apter, in: E. Apter and W. Pietz (eds.), *Fetishism as cultural discourse*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Latour, Bruno 1987. *Science in action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Latour, Bruno 1993. *We have never been modern*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Latour, Bruno 1999. *Pandora's hope: Essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Lemke, Jay 2002. Travels in hypermodality. *Visual Communication* 1(3):299-325
- Madge, Clare and O'Connor, Henrietta 2002. On-line with e-mums: Exploring the internet as a medium for research. *Area* 34(1):92-102
- Marcus, George E. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:95-117
- Markham, Annette 1998. *Life online: Researching real experience in virtual space*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press
- Paccagnella, Luciano 1997. Getting the seats of your pants dirty: Strategies for ethnographic research on virtual communities. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 3(1). [Online]
Available: <<http://jcmc.huji.ac.il/vol3/issue1/paccagnella.html>>. [Nov 8, 1997]
- Rheingold, Howard 2002. *Smart mobs: The next social revolution*. Reading, MA: Perseus Publishing
- Sarangi, Srikant and Slembrouck, Stef 1996. *Language, bureaucracy and social control*. London: Longman

- Scollon, Ron 2001. Action and text: Towards an integrated understanding of the place of text in social (inter)action, mediated discourse analysis and the problems of social action, in: R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, London: Sage
- Scollon, Ron and Scollon, Suzie Wong 2003. *Discourse in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge
- Selman, Peter (ed.) 2000. *Intercountry adoption: Developments, trends and perspectives*. London: British Agencies for Adoption and Fostering
- Shiu, Anthony 2001. Flexible production: International adoption, race, whiteness. *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 6(1-2). [Online]. Available: <<http://social.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v6i1-2/shiu.htm>>
- Swales, John 1998. *Other floors, other voices: A textography of a small university building*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Telfer, Jon 1999. Relationships with no body? — 'Adoption' photographs, intuition and emotion. *Social Analysis* 43(3):144-158
- Wellman, Barry 2002. Little boxes, glocalization, and networked individualism, in: M. Tanabe (ed.), *Digital cities II: Computational and sociological approaches*, Berlin: Springer Verlag
- Wenger, Etienne 1998. *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

"Zwei languages *zusammenputten*"¹: Bilingual ways of expressing bicultural identities

Alexandra Münch and Doris Stolberg

University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany
amuench@rumms.uni-mannheim.de
dorisstolberg@aol.com

Introduction

The availability of linguistic resources plays a crucial role when sociocultural identities are constructed in interpersonal interaction. When looking at ways of how language is used to fulfil this purpose, the behaviour of bilinguals is particularly revealing because the structure of the bilingual linguistic repertoire is often more transparent than that of a "monolingual" repertoire.

In our research project on contact phenomena between German and English, we investigate bilingual speech patterns of first generation German immigrants to the USA². In our presentation we focus on the analysis of a tape-recorded free interaction which took place among five bilingual speakers aged 59-82, and we are concentrating on two of the speakers, both of them women. These speakers, we will call them *Laura* and *Toni*³, immigrated to the USA as young adults with hardly any prior knowledge of English.

Both speakers have lived in the USA for most of their lives. They worked in English-speaking environments, they started families, and they have monolingual (English) as well as bilingual (English/German) friends. Both of them are still in touch with family members in Germany. They are proficient speakers of both languages.

We have found that the sociocultural identities our bilingual informants construct can be markedly different, even when the linguistic preconditions are quite similar. Based on our findings we challenge the assumption that differences in bilingual behaviour are necessarily due to differences in the degree of bilingual competence (as suggested by, e.g., Poplack 1980). Our informants exhibit a fluent command of English as well as German, which is demonstrated in a number of (nearly)

¹ 'putting two languages together'/'to put to languages together'

² We wish to thank our project heads Rosemarie Tracy and Elsa Lattey for their support and helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper and the DFG (German Research Foundation) for funding our research (DFG research group "Sprachvariation"/TP5).

³ The names have been changed in order to protect the informants' privacy.

monolingual passages in both languages. Nevertheless, their bilingual production differs in several ways from each other with respect to patterns of language mixing.

	<i>Laura</i>	<i>Toni</i>
place of origin/birth in Germany (year of birth)	Stuttgart (1934)	Munich (1918)
year of immigration to the USA	1954	1936
context of immigration	following her American husband	with parents & younger sister
age at time of immigration	20	18
places lived in (USA)	New York State, Florida	New York State, Florida
exposure to English in Germany	private language school (British English, less than half a year); personal letters from the USA, dictionary	at school (approx. 1 year)
acquisition of English in the USA	living environment, (first) husband & his family, TV	at work, living environment, later TV
total exposure to English in years ⁴	46 years	64 years
actively used varieties	Stuttgart Swabian, Standard German, Bavarian influence; English (standard/colloquial)	Munich Bavarian, Standard German, Northern German influence; English (standard/colloquial)
language(s) of/with the <u>partner(s)</u>	English (with first husband); German (with second husband) married twice; first husband (Italo-) American, second husband German (from Munich); widowed	German/mixed married twice; both husbands from Northern Germany (Bremerhaven area); widowed
language(s) with their <u>children</u>	English only with children (one daughter knows some German from visits to Germany)	little German/mostly English with daughter; English only with son-in-law, granddaughters etc.

Figure 1: Biographical and sociolinguistic background (Laura/Toni)

Despite their similarities, particularly with regard to their age and manner of learning English and the considerable length of exposure (shaded areas in the table), the two informants show noticeably different profiles in their linguistic behaviour – not so much in the total amount of English or German they use but in the way they arrange their linguistic resources. Laura puts her emphasis on the *separation* of her linguistic resources, demonstrating that being German and being American are two different aspects of her life. Toni, on the other hand, with a strong tendency to mix English and German, constructs an *integrated* German-American identity (cf. Lattey/Tracy, in press).

2. The overall profiles: Language preferences in changing contexts

We receive a first impression of the individual speakers' profiles when we look at the proportion of English and German used by them during the recorded interaction. A word count showed that Laura produces close to 70 % German items, and only 30 % of her linguistic production is in English. She uses only very few ambiguous lexical items. For Toni, a little more than half of her linguistic production is in German (about 55 %) and about 42 % in English (ca. 3 % blends or ambiguous items, such as 'ja'/'yeah').

Language choice as an adjustment to linguistic context

We found that Laura and Toni differ in their language choices in relation to the linguistic input, i.e. in relation to the language of the previous utterance (turn). There is a noticeable difference in their matching of the (preceding) linguistic context. This is illustrated in Figures 2 (Laura) and 3 (Toni).

⁴ at the time of the recording




Figure 2: Linguistic adjustment to previous turns/Laura




Figure 3: Linguistic adjustment to previous turns/Toni

While both speakers prefer German after German turns and English after English turns, there are two major differences between Laura and Toni:

- Laura prefers German after mixed turns, while Toni prefers English after mixed turns. Thus, Laura appears to consider mixed utterances as part of German discourse, while Toni prefers to consider mixed utterances as part of English discourse. Mixed turns offer a choice to the speakers regarding the language they prefer. Therefore, mixed contexts reveal the divergent individual preferences of the speakers most clearly.
- With respect to German, Laura adjusts her language choice more often to the language of previous utterances than Toni does. After a German turn, Laura mainly uses German and very rarely English. Toni does not differentiate as strictly between the different linguistic contexts.

2. Individual speakers' profiles: Details

Patterns of language mixing: amount and types of mixing

Amount of mixing

Individual mixing patterns become discernible in the language choice of the clauses our informants produced. (We considered all complete clauses Laura and Toni produced during the recording.) As Figure 4 illustrates, both speakers produce more German clauses than mixed or English clauses, but

the distribution of the three clause types is different for each speaker. (Note that this representation refers to *intrasentential* mixing only.)




Figure 4: Speakers' clauses by language (in relative percentages)
(Laura: $n = 390$ /Toni: $n = 877$)

Laura produces more purely German clauses than Toni does, and all *unmixed* clauses together constitute over 90% of her overall production. Her profile is marked by a strong preference to separate German and English in bilingual interaction.

Toni's profile is marked by a relatively more balanced use of all three clause types (German/English/mixed). The proportion of mixed clauses is noticeably higher than in Laura's production. Toni's readiness to mix German and English is a recurrent feature of her bilingual profile also in other recordings.

Types of mixing

Blends⁵ and Crossover⁶

Laura's speech in general is characterized by a pronounced separation of her languages. This is reflected in the types of mixing we find in her data. Blends (mixing on the word level) and crossover phenomena, i.e. intense forms of mixing, are extremely rare. There is only one instance where Laura creates blended forms. She is fully aware of it, it is done on purpose and in reaction to a blend coined by another interlocutor – in order to point out politely that this is not what she considers to be “proper language”:

- (1) LK: *Teacherin?* *Gibt's sowas, e teacherin?* [LAUGHS]
-FEMALE? Does that exist, a -FEMALE?
Zwei languages *zusammenputten!*
two together- -INFIN
(TELMA-1, 341-344)

Laura's reaction and her own blend show that she “knows how to do blends”, i.e. the absence of this type of mixing phenomena from her data is a matter of choice and not of lack of ability.

Toni's utterances stand out in that she intensely mixes elements from English and German (Standard German and Bavarian German) on all linguistic levels. We find blends on the word level as well as crossover phenomena such as German words with English structure, for example:

- (2) TG: *Ich wollt* *eigent-lich* *noch gar nicht* *einen*, [instead of Gm. *keinen* none]
I wanted actually not yet one

⁵ *Blend*: one lexical item combining morphological and/or phonological material from more than one language (mixing on word level)

⁶ *Crossover* in the context of language mixing is defined as the combination of lexical material from one language with a syntactic structure from the other language (Tracy / Lattey in pr.).

I wanned to wait until they were/ be a little more refined but-ähm,[...]

(TELMA-1, 707-709)

In the analyzed recording, Toni's mixed utterances follow German, English and mixed previous turns by other informants equally (see Figure 3 above), which shows that she feels very comfortable with mixing. Besides these mixed utterances we also find stretches that are monolingual German or English.

Insertional and Alternational Mixing

Based on Muysken (2000), we count as instances of insertional mixing clauses in which words or single constituents from language A are inserted into a language-B environment. Insertional mixing always refers to intrasentential mixing.

Alternational mixing (Muysken 2000) is understood to refer to cases in which the mixed material consists of more than one element but does not form a constituent; cases in which the mixed material occurs at a clause boundary (these are ambiguous if the mixed material is one word or one constituent); and all cases of intersentential mixing.

For Laura, the large majority of her mixed clauses are unambiguous cases of insertional mixing, mainly with one-word insertions, for example:

- (3) LK: Im-e *basement* möchte I net wohnen.
in a I would not like to live

(TELMA-1, 1431)

- (4) LK: [...] wenn i Birnen ess den ganzen Tag un-und *escarole* Salat [...]
if I pears eat the whole day an-and salad

(TELMA-1, 1424)

Only two clauses (out of her 390 clauses) clearly contain alternational mixes, three clauses are ambiguous (insertional/alternational). That is, alternational mixing within clause boundaries is practically non-existent in her data. In Laura's data, alternational mixing is generally restricted to clause and turn boundaries.

In Toni's utterances we find many cases of insertional as well as alternational mixing. Most of the inserted items are noun phrases, discourse markers and tags, which occur very frequently (especially English DMs and tags in English, German or mixed contexts), and sometimes adverbials. She also exhibits functional code-switching to mark asides, for self-corrections and contrasts, and for structuring her discourse, e.g. when presenting quotations. In her alternational mixing she mostly but not always respects clause boundaries.

- insertional and alternational mixing:

- (5) TG: [...] da war Lichauer's und *all those restaurants*, und *that's where my aunt's bank* war, [...]

there was Lichauer's and [insertion] and [alternation] was

(TELMA-1, 716-717)

- alternational mixing:

- (6) TG: *She works days now (then) cause she* mog des lieber, na kriegts' net ganz so vui.
likes that better, then she gets not quite as much [money]

(TELMA-1, 1499)

Stability of profile

Laura's speech is characterized by long stretches in German (with few insertions of English items) and long stretches in English (with few insertions of German items). Thus, when Laura switches (alternational mixing), she “resets” her language choice almost completely.

We found that Laura keeps her individual mixing profile throughout the group interaction just as she does in one-on-one interactions. The group interaction appears to affect her linguistic choices only in that she uses more English (during some one-on-one interactions, Laura speaks German almost exclusively). Her mixing patterns remain unchanged and reflect a stable individual mixing profile.

Toni, on the other hand, does not separate her languages strictly but uses whatever language fits best what she wants to say in each situation. She does not monitor her language mixing overtly in any restrictive way, and it can be seen from all her recordings (group as well as one-on-one situations) that she feels very comfortable with mixing in bilingual contexts. For this particular recording it can even be said that she has a leading role in that her mixing behaviour leads the conversation into a more “mixed mode” in general.

Toni's mixing behaviour remains stable in all situations, i.e. she keeps to her individual mixing profile, just as Laura keeps to hers.

Discourse markers and language choice

We looked at discourse markers (DMs) in more detail because they sometimes seem to follow their own rules with respect to mixing. We found, for example, long stretches of monolingual German speech, interspersed only with a number of English tags (*you know, right*) in several recordings (including the one analyzed here). The question we set out to answer is: Does the distribution of DMs fit in with bilingual speakers' profiles that were identified on the basis of mixing patterns and distributional frequencies in the use of German and English, or do they follow a different pattern?

We compared the distribution of 12 English and 16 German (roughly corresponding) items in English and German contexts. Our choice was guided by frequency of occurrence in our data as well as the earlier identification and discussion of most of these DMs by Schiffrin (1987, for English), Fuller (2001, for the bilingual German/English context), and Norrby/Wirdeñäs (2003, regarding the expression of discourse identities in Swedish). Included are discourse markers *per se* (e.g., *well, you know*), connectors (*but, because, so*) and modal adverbs and particles (e.g., *actually, really*).

(E: you know, right; because, but, so; maybe, just, actually, really; well, I think, I mean.

G: weisst(e), gell, net; weil, aber; also, vielleicht, wahrscheinlich, halt, ja, mal, doch, eigentlich; ich glaube, ich denke, ich meine.)




Figure 5: **Laura** / DMs in varying linguistic contexts (in %)




Figure 6: **Toni** / DMs in varying linguistic contexts (in %)

Observations

- Toni uses discourse markers more frequently than Laura does.
- In Laura's utterances, German DMs are more frequent than English ones; for Toni, the opposite is true (i.e., she uses more English DMs).
- Both informants clearly prefer to use discourse markers in linguistically matching environments (i.e., German – German or English – English); however, Toni is more prone to using discourse devices in “non-matching” environments than Laura is; Laura uses no discourse markers in unambiguously non-matching environments.
- Toni more often inserts English DMs in a German context than German DMs in English. In mixed contexts, she uses DMs from both languages equally.

In sum, Laura's use of discourse markers is characterized by a clear separation of the languages: DMs only occur in matching environments. Only mixed contexts allow for some variation.

Toni, in full agreement with other features of her profile, is more open to mixing and certainly does not separate the two languages strictly. Nevertheless, a clear context sensitivity is reflected in her preferred use of DMs that match their language environment.

3. Discussion of the findings

We found that Laura and Toni diverge in the ways in which they make use of their language repertoire and, especially, in the patterns of their language mixing and separation. The table in Figure 7 sums up the main characteristics of their profiles.

	Laura	Toni
adjustment to context	yes, strongly	yes, to a certain degree
preference in ambiguous (mixed) context (turns)	German	English
blends (word-level mixes)	only three instances (produced on purpose to express disagreement with this type of mixing)	frequent
insertional mixing	insertions rare (intrasentential mixes in general are rare)	insertions frequent
alternational mixing	preferred over insertional mixing, but (almost) exclusively at clause and turn	intra- and intersententially

	boundaries	
discourse markers	language matching in unambiguous contexts is 100%; in mixed contexts variable	tendency to adhere to language of context, but not exclusively

Figure 7: Profile features in comparison (Laura/Toni)

As we pointed out at the beginning, crucial features of Laura's and Toni's acquisition of English (age at onset, learning environment, geographical location, length of exposure) were similar. Further, both have a thorough command of English as well as German, as demonstrated by long monolingual turns by both speakers. Nevertheless, each woman shows her own individual pattern of mixing and language interaction. This observation is a challenge to the assumption made by Poplack (1980) that certain patterns of language mixing (or switching) are due to different degrees of language competence and to differences in the age of second language acquisition.

Poplack concluded from the linguistic behavior of her informants, Spanish-English bilinguals in the USA, that switching behavior correlated closely with the age of L2 (i.e., English) acquisition and self-rated bilingual ability. She found that fluent bilinguals who acquired English early (age 2 – 13) favored *intrasentential* switches and switched at various syntactic boundaries. Spanish-dominant late learners of English (after age 13) preferred *intersentential* switching and tag-like switches (i.e., switching of tag-like elements such as interjections, fillers, tags, and idiomatic expressions).

From this, she concluded that for tag-like switches “only minimal knowledge” of the L2 grammar is needed, that the switching of full sentences or larger segments (i.e., intersentential switching, alternational mixing) “require[s] much more knowledge of L2 to produce”, and, finally, that intrasentential switches (insertional and alternational mixing) are of the most demanding kind because “the speaker must (...) know enough about the grammar of each language, and the way they interact, to avoid ungrammatical utterances.” (Poplack 1980:650)

Compared to Poplack's informants, our two informants belong in her group of late L2 learners (starting after age 13). Based on Poplack's results we should hypothesize that mixing behavior should be fairly homogeneous between the two speakers, and that switching of tag-like elements would be most frequent in the speech of our informants, followed by intersentential mixing and a rather low proportion of intrasentential mixing. As we demonstrated, this does not coincide with our results. Toni shows intrasentential mixing much more than Laura does, but she also produces more tag-like mixes than Laura (mixing of DMs). Both of them mix along clause and turn boundaries (intersentential mixing).

Our findings disagree with Poplack's results in two ways: Firstly, the switching hierarchy Poplack suggests does not match the mixing patterns of our informants. Secondly, the age factor can apparently be “softened” by other factors such as length of exposure to English. Patterns of language mixing are obviously not determined exclusively by the age and the circumstances of second language acquisition. They are also the result of individual preference, of personality traits, and certainly of the way in which a bilingual person sees and positions herself in her bilingual and bicultural environment.

4. Bilingual patterns, bicultural lives

Our analysis shows that two individuals with comparable linguistic preconditions (acquisition context, competence, etc.) show diverging bilingual language use, i.e. competence does not necessarily determine linguistic/bilingual behaviour in any case, as has been claimed previously (e.g. Poplack 1980). Here, the diverging attitudes towards a bilingual/bicultural life are reflected by

the language use of these individuals. One individual (Laura) strictly separates her two languages, even in bilingual contexts and even if the other interlocutors in the group mix their languages very freely. Separation of English and German and correct language use are important for her, which is additionally highlighted by her metalinguistic remarks. She clearly separates her American and German identities which she shows through this language behaviour.

In contrast, the other individual (Toni) tends to mix her two languages freely and intensely, especially in bilingual contexts. However, even in monolingual passages her utterances contain elements of the other language. Toni has a more integrated bilingual identity and puts no strong emphasis on “correct” or “pure” language, which results in intense language mixing. This type of language behaviour shows that she has created an integrated German-American identity.

Thus, the individual use of their repertoire of languages enables these speakers to express their attitude towards a bilingual/bicultural life iconically by arranging their languages in a specific and individual pattern.

References

- Fuller, Janet M. 2001. The principle of pragmatic detachability in borrowing: English-origin discourse markers in Pennsylvania German. *Linguistics* 39-2: 351-369
- Lattey, Elsa and Rosemarie Tracy (in press). “Well, I tell you, das war’n Zeiten!” A German-American profile. in: V. Hinnenkamp and K. Meng, eds. *Sprachgrenzen überspringen. Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Muysken, Pieter 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norrby, Catrin and Karolina Wirdeñäs 2003. Swedish youth discourse: on performing relevant selves in interaction. in: J. Androutsopoulos, A. Georgakopoulou, eds.. *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Poplack, Shana 1980. Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in English Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Schiffrin, Deborah 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yuko Taniguchi: Affect and the EFL classroom: Language contact in addressing
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
80-92
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Yuko Taniguchi and the Editors, 2005

Affect and the EFL Classroom: Language Contact in Addressing

Yuko Taniguchi

University of Limerick, Mary Immaculate College, Ireland
yuko_t@ga3.so-net.ne.jp

Abstract

This study investigates affect or affective elements between the teacher and students in EFL classroom interaction. Affect is regarded as a linguistically significant phenomenon in interactions, which are analysed contextually. The focus is on addressing students, (who are native speakers of Japanese), by teachers (native speakers of English). This verbal act in EFL classroom designates students' names that come from their native language and it indicates parts of their self-identities. Therefore, affect in this study is formulated particularly in interaction where contact between the students' native language and the teacher's native language occurs. The results of this study show that affect is produced along with different teachers' orientations towards teaching and the student's reaction to it. Particularly, affect operates negatively, when the context of addressing is perceived negatively. This study reveals that affect is tangible in cross-cultural encounters and plays a significant role in human interaction.

Introduction

Human beings are emotional creatures: It is obvious that we feel something while we use language in interaction with others (cf. Finegan 1999). Interactions in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom involve various types of human communications. It would, therefore, be natural to imagine that such emotional aspects of interactions can be observed in the EFL classroom. One example: A student came late to an EFL classroom, while a teacher was introducing 'the topic of the day' to other students. Having been interrupted, however, the teacher stopped talking to the class and said to the particular student emphatically '*Takeshi*' (in which 'ke' of Takeshi was strongly pronounced), and then 'Good morning.' The student sat down at his seat quietly and felt embarrassed because the teacher's way of pronouncing his name sounded negative to him.

The EFL classroom is generally considered as a setting where teaching and learning EFL is conducted. English is introduced through content; it can also be used as a language of the classroom. Teachers interact with students verbally or nonverbally for different purposes in the classroom. Meanwhile, the student's native language always exists in the classroom, whether it is linguistically apparent or not. This is because students are human beings who are competent in their own native language. In other words, the EFL classroom is a setting that provides contact between the students' language and target language. Teachers and students experience such contact between the languages used in the classroom. Due to this linguistic contact, both the teachers and the students experience certain feelings particularly produced in the classroom.

In this study, therefore, I will pay a special attention to emotional aspects of the language used in the EFL classroom arising through contact between the target language and students' native language. This study will examine affect produced through contact between the target language and students' native language, through focus on teachers' use of address forms (i.e. students' given names). The affect examined is instantiated by this very type of interaction in EFL classroom. In this study, I will analyse affect by looking specifically at stress placement on the students' names in teachers' pronunciation of their names.

Previous studies

Studies on affect

People's feelings induced alongside their production of speech have primarily been discussed in disciplines other than linguistics, such as psychology. However, there are some linguists who have considered affect as emotional force produced by language used at interaction. One example is Ochs and Schieffelin (1989) who comprehensively listed linguistic research on affect. They categorise various previous studies related to affect into four groups, which include Jakobson (1969), Halliday (1975), Bakhtin (1981) and Labov (1984). It should be also noted that scholars in the discipline of pragmatics have also been aware of importance of affect in language use for a long time (cf. Searle 1965, Brown and Levinson 1987, Verschueren 2001).

Affect as discussed in this study is something that is produced not by using expressions of emotions. Rather, it refers to one's state of emotion produced with the language use in interaction. Therefore, this study does not deal with feeling or emotion that certain expressions describe directly, which is explored through a cognitive view of language in past decades (Wierzbicka 1992, Lakoff and Kövecses 1987).

Studies on foreign language teaching and learning

In studies in TEFL, the researchers' attention to the phenomenon of the contact between the target language and students' native language in EFL classroom dates back to the era of contrastive analysis. However, contrastive analysis looks at syntactic structure between the languages in order to predict (see Lado 1957) or at least explain (see Wardhaugh 1970) learners' difficulties in learning the linguistic system of the target language (Brown 1994). This is only one aspect of analysing a phenomenon of language contact. Studies on cross-cultural pragmatics were conducted extensively in late 80s and 90s (cf. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984, Beebe and Takahashi 1989). Most of these studies singled out a smaller unit, (i.e. speech act such as apology and request) in order to compare these pragmatics aspects (similarity or difference) between the two languages. The scholars in these studies attempted to find out the ways to overcome possible difficulties that learners (and teachers) might face in pragmatics aspects of both the target language and the learner's native language. It is also possible to say that a certain affective aspect is implicitly discussed in cross-cultural pragmatics studies, since pragmatic difference or similarity between the two languages may cause certain feeling in learners (Taniguchi 1994, 1996). The contact between languages will include various aspects of language which are interwoven in a complex way (cf. Widdowson 1996). Affect produced between a teacher and students due to contact between the target language and students' native language has not received much attention.

In addition, affective aspects in studies on foreign language teaching and learning have been widely discussed, but these have mainly been explored from psychological perspectives (e.g. McDonough 1986, Horwitz et al 1986, MacIntyre & Gardner 1991). Affect produced by language use has not

received much attention in those studies. In this respect, this study is worthwhile, as it investigates affect or emotional force from perspectives of language use: affect is discussed as a consequence of the linguistic contact in EFL classroom.

Studies of address form and their relevance to this study

In order to investigate affect in the EFL classroom produced by language use, this study focuses on use of address forms. I will particularly look at native English teachers' use of students' names (in Japanese). There are several reasons for the focus on address forms. Address forms (i.e. names) are used to identify individuals: they also reflect social relationships with others (Leech 1989). Moreover, address form use reflects self and/or social identity (Jernudd 1994): This is because people's own names are often derived from their native language and culture. Use of address forms (names) is directly related to those individuals who are interacting with each other; therefore, use of a certain address form is related to affective aspects existing between addressers and addressees, such as feelings of closeness and/or feelings of distance (cf. Braun 1989, Maynard 2002).

Address form use in this study is analysed particularly by looking at features of stress placement. Analysing stress placement has not much received attention among address form studies. This is because address form use has been traditionally studied as lexical selection, in order to investigate meaning in contexts (Brown and Gilman 1960 for discussion of power and solidarity, and also see Braun 1988, Oyetade, 1995). However, this study analyses stress placement to reveal affect realized as signals of interpretively significant aspect of the given context. In other words, this study examines affect at pragmatic level. As in the example of the student being late for the class presented above, suprasegmental features of language including the variation of stress placement on names would affect one's emotional reaction to the addresser. Looking at stress placement of address form use may therefore reveal a more concrete evidence of producing affect in the interaction at face-to-face.

This study will particularly analyse stress placement on address forms (i.e. names of students) by native English teachers. Thus, this study looks at contact between English and students' native language (Japanese), as students' names which are derived from their native language. In other words, affect due to contact between the languages is discussed by focusing on stress placement on address forms (names).

Approach to the Analysis

I analyse affect by looking at phonological features of the teacher's addressing to students' names: The analysis of the data is thus conducted at the pragmatic level. I particularly focus on whether or not English stress rules are applied in the students' Japanese names pronounced by the English speaker teachers.


In this study, students' names are derived from Japanese. This is a language which is characterised by syllable-timed rhythm: Each syllable in a word mostly has equal duration (Kubozono 1999, Enomoto 2001). Thus, it is impossible to place stress in a word that is accompanied with an increase of length of the syllable. On the other hand, English – in this case the language of the classroom and the native language of the teachers – is characterised by stress-timed rhythm. This means that a syllable in a word is pronounced with stress, and is prominent in terms of length as well as pitch and loudness.

The phonological difference between English and Japanese is explained by a notion of 'phonotactics'. It is based on an idea that each language has certain constraints to characterise its

phonological features (Kreidler 1989). In other words, a name whose syllables mostly have equal duration reflects the phonotactics of Japanese, while a name with stressed syllable reflects the phonotactics of English.

Both of the teachers who participated in this study are native English speakers; the students' names appeared in this study are Japanese. Therefore, in this study, I will describe whether each instance of the teachers' addressing according to whether it follows typical Japanese phonological rules or not. This is illustrated in Figure 1: One end of the continuum represents a way of addressing following the phonotactics of Japanese, while the other end represents addressing according to English stress rule, i.e., stress of words in English is placed on the penultimate syllable (Kreidler 1989).

Figure 1. Variation of stress placement on students' names (names of three syllables, the last syllable having an open vowel)



Since all the students participating in this study have Japanese names, the teachers are likely to pronounce their Japanese names in a Japanese manner in order to appear polite. On the other hand, the teachers also produce the students' names as pronounced in English in terms of stress placements. Therefore, this study focuses on different stress placements in order to examine affect in the teachers' addressing of the students in interactions in EFL classroom.

Data Collection

The data were mainly collected through the observations of EFL lessons conducted by two different teachers in the UK, along with interviews with the teachers as well as the students in the lessons. The observations were largely video-recorded. The interviews were conducted by showing the recordings to the participants.

The lessons that I have observed were taught by two native speakers of British English, John Smith and Karen Parker. Their students were all Japanese students who had come to the UK from Japan. Both groups of students (nine from John's lesson and ten from Karen's lesson) enrolled English programmes at institutions starting at April in 2001. They were all young adults except one who was 26 years old at the time of the observations.

John has over four years' experience of teaching EFL in Japan. He has a receptive skill in Japanese which was good enough to understand what the students said in Japanese during the lessons. He also sometimes uses Japanese briefly to the students during the lessons. On the other hand, Karen did not have any knowledge of the Japanese language, although she had experience with teaching

many Japanese students and showed her understanding of certain cultural aspects of Japanese throughout her teaching career.

Among the students taught by these teachers, I particularly focus on the cases of two students: Subject 1 (whose name is Makiko) out of the nine students in John's lesson and Subject 2 (whose name is Naomi) out of ten in Karen's lesson. Both students contributed to the lessons well at the time of the observations. In the interviews with the teachers, both teachers said that those students' classroom performances were very reliable compared with the others. Subject 1 (Makiko) also said in the interview that she answered the questions by the teacher voluntarily because she wanted to move the lesson more quickly. Subject 2 (Naomi) commented during the interview that she was very interested in Karen's lessons since materials that Karen brought to the lesson were very useful for her learning.

Context of addressing and stress placement

This study examines affect produced by the teachers' use of their students' names in the EFL classroom, where the contact occurs between the target language, English and the students' native language, Japanese. In order to single out affect or affective forces carried by the addressing, I will first examine contexts where the particular addressing occurs between the teachers and the students. This examination is particularly conducted by looking at phases of the lessons where the teachers interacted with each of the students and at the same time the teacher needed to manage the whole group of the students. In other words, I will focus on 'public' aspects of classroom interaction and exclude phases of individual work or work in pairs/groups, which are conducted rather privately in terms of teaching.

In this study, I focus particularly on the first 50 minute segments out of the 90 minutes' John's lesson, excluding 5 minute pair work: I also focus on a total of 40 minute segments out of the two hours' of Karen's lesson, excluding individual work or pair/group work. The result is shown in Table 1. As this table shows, addressing by both of the teachers occurs in seven different contexts: They are 'elicitation for the teacher's expected response', 'elicitation for confirmation', 'asking for co-operation', 'calling for attention', 'encouragement for completing a response', 'giving a direction' and 'warning'. In other words, affect will be produced from these contexts.

Table 1: Contexts of addressing to Makiko and Naomi

	John's addressing to Makiko (11)	Karen's addressing to Naomi (7)
Elicitation for the teacher's expected response	2	5
Elicitation for confirmation	1	
Asking for co-operation		1
Calling for attention	1	
Encouragement for completing a response	2	
Giving a direction	2	1
Warning	3	

Both of the teachers showed different variations of stress placed on students' names (i.e. Makiko and Naomi). Stress placed by following phonological rules in English (stress is placed on the next to the last syllable) occurs only twice. As illustrated in Table 2, one occurs in a context of

‘elicitation for the teacher’s expected response’ by Karen, while the other occurs in the context ‘warning’ by John.

Karen addressed Subject 2 (Naomi) a total of seven times during the segments of her teaching. The stress placed on the next to the last (penultimate) syllable of Naomi [næ.O.mi] occurred only once during the segments: This stress placement was not observed in any contexts during the period of the lesson. In other words, this particular addressing was significant, as the teacher was back to using English to the student.

Table 2 Variations of stress placement according to contexts of addressing¹

	John’s addressing Makiko (11)	Karen’s addressing Naomi (7)
Elicitation for the teacher’s expected response	ma.ki.ko (2)	næ.o.mi (2) Næ.o.mi (2) næ.O.mi (1)* ²
Elicitation for confirmation	ma.ki.ko (1)	
Asking for co-operation		næ.O.mi (1)*
Calling for attention	ma.ki.ko (1)	
Encouragement for completing a response	ma.ki.ko (2)	
Giving a direction	ma.ki.ko (2)	Næ.o.mi (1)
Warning	ma.ki.ko (2) ma.KI.ko (1)*	


Karen also addressed Naomi by placing stress on the third syllable from the last (i.e., [Næ. o. mi]) in the context of ‘elicitation for the teacher’s expected response’: This occurs twice. In these examples, stress is not placed where stress is supposed to be placed according to the English phonological rules (i.e., the next to last syllable). These examples, however, are not considered a reflection of the English phonological rules, even though stress is placed on her name in this addressing.

Moreover, according to a Japanese accent rule, accentuation occurs on [Næ] – the third syllable from the last (Enomoto 2001): The pitch drops suddenly right after that syllable. Thus, if stress is placed on the [Næ] of Naomi the interpretation will be that the teacher intends to pronounce it to sound Japanese (See Figure 2).

It should be also noted that I interviewed Karen after the observation. She said that pronouncing the name of Naomi was easy, compared to using other students’ names in her lesson, such as Yukiyo. This is because Naomi also exists as a British name, though its pronunciation of [næ] of Naomi is not exactly the same. Thus, the teacher was likely to feel comfortable with pronouncing this Japanese student’s name, Naomi.

¹ Analysis of stress placement has been conducted with no reference to noise-reduction.

² * indicates that stress placement reflects English phonotactics.

	Following Japanese phonological rules		Following English phonological rules
			
Karen's addressing <i>Naomi</i>	næ.o.mi (2)	Næ.o.mi (2)	næ.O.mi (1)
John's addressing <i>Makiko</i>	ma.ki.ko (2)		

In addition, I have observed that his addressing did not reflect the English phonological rules significantly during the entire period of the lesson that I have recorded. It should also be noted that John seems to have understood what the students were saying in Japanese, while Karen does not seem to have understood it at all. He even said at the interview that he used Japanese to the students when he thought it was necessary. Thus, it is certain that he had some knowledge of how he should pronounce students' Japanese names in Japanese.

Pragmatic interpretation of stress placement: Affect

Example 1: Subject 1, Makiko

1. John: What could you say, if you don't want to do it?
2. Kayoko: (*non-elicited*) Actually...
3. John: Actually, good... actually
4. Kayoko: I go ... I want...
5. John: 'I want' is, OK... 'I want' is too strong ...yes?... 'I want' is maybe children say 'I want'. yes. But what ... what we would say?
6. Kayoko: Would
7. John: OK... I'd. I would ... I'd.
8. Kayoko: I like
- 9.→ John: I'd like ... or, do you remember this ... this special word (pointing at Makiko with his hand) *Makiko?* [ma.ki.ko]?

10. Makiko: Rather.
 11. John: Rather, yes, I'd rather ...actually I'd rather ... I'd rather go to
 12. Kayoko (*non-elicited*) a Chinese restaurant
 (# 3)

The first example is John's addressing *Makiko*. Before John turns to Makiko (which is turn 9), John was interacting with Kayoko to elicit her answer. However, he was not able to elicit a word or a phrase that he wanted from Kayoko. By addressing *Makiko* (turn 9), he gives a chance to her to give him an answer. This use of an address form, *Makiko*, is interpreted as "this is now your turn and I believe you can answer it correctly". In other words, the use implies that the teacher expects a response from *Makiko*.

Example 1 shows the teacher pronounced the student as Makiko [ma.ki.ko] in Japanese. This is the way that the teacher constantly addressed her during the observation except for one instance. Makiko was one of the students who understood and contributed to his lesson, and then the teacher was not likely to be worried about the responses from her in terms of his managing the lesson. Moreover, this addressing is asking a student to respond in the way that the teacher expects. Accordingly, we can assume that the teacher was relaxed at the time of producing this addressing of elicitation to Makiko. This affect or affective force is produced between the teacher and Makiko at the time of this addressing to Makiko. This affect was represented as [ma.ki.ko], a typical way in which the name is pronounced in Japanese.

Moreover, John produced the addressing at elicitation (i.e., 'elicitation for the teacher's expected response' and 'elicitation for confirmation') to Makiko three times. He pronounced her name in the same way each time.

There are other examples from Karen's addressing of elicitation for her expected response. This time, a student, whose name is Naomi is focused. As I have mentioned before, another teacher in this study, Karen, shows different stress placement while the addressing at the elicitation to Naomi is being produced, unlike the case of John to Makiko.

There are three examples. Example 2 occurs when 10 minutes had passed from the beginning of the lesson.

Example 2: Subject 2, Naomi

(The teacher (Karen) makes the students work in pairs and gives a different picture to each of them. One of them describes the picture and the other draws a picture according to the description. After finishing this pair work, the teacher starts talking to the class about vocabulary.)

1. Karen: Kana, can you describe the difference between pillow and cushion?
2. Kana: Pillow is for sleep?
3. Karen: sleeping.
4. Kana: For sleeping
5. Karen: Yes.
6. Kana: Cushion is, may be on the on the [sofa=]
7. Karen: [um-hum.]
8. Kana: =or chair, Umm to ... to comfor... to be comfortable when you sleeping.
9. → Karen: (*looking at the students*) Good. Yes, yes. Could you have cushions on a bed? ...
 (*looking at Naomi*) Naomi [Næ.o.mi], Did you you could have a pillow and cushions on a bed? Is that possible?

10. Naomi: I think so.
11. Karen: Yes, in fact in your picture, that's what we had, [wasn't it]. Yes,
12. Naomi: [Uhhh.]

Before addressing Naomi (which is turn 9), Karen asks Kana about difference between a pillow and a cushion (which is turn 1). This is because Karen overheard Kana having difficulty in describing the difference between those two words during the pair work. At the same time, Karen also knows that Naomi has a picture showing not only a pillow but also cushions which were placed on the bed. Therefore, Naomi must know the difference from her picture. Subsequently, Karen asked Naomi to answer the question, and this use of *Naomi* [Næ.o.mi] must occur at 'eliciting the teacher's expected response' from her.

Example 3: Subject 2, Naomi

(This segment takes place about 45 minutes after the beginning of the lesson. The teacher (Karen) is operating with true-or-false questions. She has first shown a picture card to each of the students and then read six statements related to the pictures. The students write down True or False according to whether the sentences are matched with the picture card or not. Then, Karen asks the students about what the statements she read are and whether they are true or not. After checking the first set of the questions, the Karen is now going to ask Naomi about the second set of the questions.)

1. Karen: Oh. Very good. Yes. yes. ...*(laughing)*. Excellent..... Very observant. Do you remember the second sentence, *Naomi* [næ.o.mi]
2. Naomi: *Ee...to* ('well'). There are are, *Ee* ('un')?... The the lamp above the table was white. That is white.
3. Karen: Uh-hum. Good
4. Naomi: And it's false.

Example 3 shows that Karen nominates Naomi for answering the questions. It is the second set of questions in this activity. The student who was nominated to answer the first set of the questions had showed a lack of confidence while responding to the teacher, despite the fact that the questions were easy. Thus, the teacher nominated a more reliable student for the next set of the questions. Since Naomi is one of the students who contributes to the lesson consistently, Karen is likely to expect a correct response from Naomi at the time of addressing her. Therefore, this use of addressing Naomi must occur at eliciting the teacher's expected response.

Example 4: Subject 2, Naomi

(This is at the end of the lesson. Karen has asked the students to get in a pair and talk about their own favourite rooms at home. Then she is going to ask four students to talk about their partners' favourite room in class. After Aki, Karen is going to ask Naomi to talk about this.)

1. Karen: And Aki what about Chiaki. What is her favourite room.
(Aki starts talking about it and the teacher is saying to Naomi.)
2. Karen: And Naomi [næ.O.mi], what was Mai's favourite room and why?
(Naomi is talking about it and the lesson is over.)

Example 4 occurs at the end of the lesson. Karen asks four of the students to talk about their partner's favourite room. This is a follow-up activity for the previous pair work. At the follow-up phase, Naomi is the last student whom Karen asked a question. The other three students who have been nominated for this activity have also finished their talk without much difficulty. Hence, we can assume that this task is not difficult for Naomi either. Since Naomi has always contributed to

her lessons, Karen's use of addressing Naomi here occurs at 'elicitation for her expected response'. This time, the teacher puts stress on the second syllable of her name, which follows English phonological rules.

These three examples from Karen's lesson also show addressing of 'elicitation for the teacher's expected response'. Unlike the cases of John's addressing to *Makiko* discussed earlier, Karen happens to pronounce the student's name in a way that English phonological rules are reflected at addressing of 'elicitation for the teacher's expected response'. It occurs at the time of addressing to the student who follows and contributes to the lesson well. Since the student's name is derived from Japanese, it is supposed to (or at least one should attempt to) be pronounced in the way it is pronounced in Japanese, in order to appear polite to the students. Therefore, we can see that this stress placement (reflecting English phonological rules in Example 4) occurs when Karen is not likely to be relaxed while addressing to the student. This was most significant when she was under the pressure of finishing up the lesson of the day.

It should be also noted that Karen commented on this in the interview: She admitted that she felt time pressure at the time of addressing her. She also said that this was because this addressing occurred in the last phase of the lesson, in which she was following-up the previous pair-work. If she had not completed the follow-up oral presentation, the previous pair-work would have been meaningless in term of her teaching agenda. Thus, she said she rushed to finish the following-up activity.

There are other interesting findings from the interview with the students. I have asked the seven students including Naomi about their feeling toward Karen's use of addressing their names. Their responses were all the same. They were not able to distinguish the variation in stress placement of their names that the teacher pronounced. Naomi did not even realize that a part of her name Na [na] had constantly pronounced as [næ], which sound does not belong to Japanese. None of the students had a particular feeling towards the teacher's different stress placement on their names.

On the other hand, I interviewed Makiko from John's class. She said that she was aware that the teacher sometimes pronounced her name with stress. Throughout the lessons that I video-recorded, John's stress placed on Makiko's name occurred only once. The addressing occurred in the context of warning to Makiko as Example 5 shows.

Example 5: Subject 1, Makiko

(All the students stand up and do pair work. Then, they sit down, and the teacher (John) is giving another direction for the class activity to the students.)

1. John: OK. Can you now write... your own conversation? Please write... *(briefly pointing at the board in which he had written 'A, B, A' vertically to indicate a role of a speaker in the conversation)* your own conversation *(then looking at Kayoko and Makiko)* Kayoko, Makiko [ma.KI.ko]. Can you write *(pointing at the board)* your own conversation OK?
-

When we look at the use of *Makiko* in Example 5, it appears as if the use is a part of John giving the students a direction for the next activity in the classroom. However, its pragmatic meaning can be interpreted as 'The teacher is asking you to pay attention to the activity he is explaining'. Makiko is chattering with Kayoko again, and John is addressing her as *Makiko* in order to interrupt them. This address form, *Makiko* [ma.KI.ko] is used to make her stop chattering and pay attention to the lesson. Thus, this use of *Makiko* occurs in the context of warning. This use is considered more

‘personal’ as it is not related to the class activity itself. This time, John places stress on the second syllable from the last on *Makiko* [ma. KI. ko]. This stress placement shows that he follows the English stress rule, the one of the teacher’s native language.

What we should consider in relation to this example is that it occurs when the warning for the same student was issued for the third time for the same reason – the student was chattering with the one sitting next to her. This stress shift can be contextually interpreted as ‘This is it, Makiko. It’s enough. I am very displeased with your behavior in the classroom. Stop chattering right now and concentrate on the lesson’. This stress shift shows John’s unpleasant feeling toward her misbehavior at a pragmatic level. In other words, this ‘affect’ through the stress shift carries another pragmatic meaning. John’s specific ‘affect’ toward Makiko’s misbehavior in the classroom is revealed.

This affect produced by the teacher was perceived by Makiko. This was discussed during her interview. She said that the teacher’s utterance had strength when the teacher was irritated. She also said that the teacher was not intense, when he addressed her in a way that her name was normally pronounced in Japanese. Makiko was particularly good at spotting one occasion where the teacher had put stress on her name as [ma.KI.ko].

I also interviewed another student who was present at the same lesson, and found that the student also felt that his name had been pronounced with stress when John was not relaxed towards them.

Accordingly, we can say that the students perceived affect through the addressing in the interaction between the students and the teacher. This affect is revealed in the EFL classroom, where the contact occurs between the target language, that is English and the students’ native language. In other words, the affect – which operates negatively – is realised due to the contact between the languages. On the other hand, there is addressing to the student by Karen, which did not operating interpersonally as much as John’s addressing to his students.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented my investigation of ‘affects’ in EFL classroom produced through contact between English and the students’ native language. The study has been conducted with special attention to addressing the students’ names at the interaction between the native English speaker teachers and the native Japanese speaker students. From the outcomes of the study, I was able to confirm the significance of affect represented in addressing. Moreover, the study has shown that there are different degrees in affect produced by the address form use, which depends on the teachers. Follow-up interviews with both the teachers and the students have helped me confirm this. The follow-up interviews have also shown that the students perceived affect through contact between the languages differently, depending on the teachers.

Affect produced by addressing is intangible. Therefore, it has not received enough attention by researchers. As the study has suggested, however, it plays a significant role in human interactions. In other words, the researchers who are interested in human interactions should not avoid discussing it. This kind of study is worthwhile, as it enables us to describe affect realized in interactions in particular contexts.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. in: M. Holquist ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Beebe, Leslie and Takahashi Tomoko 1989. *Do You Have a Bag? Status and Patterned Variation in Second Language Acquisition*, In: S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, and L. Selinker, eds. *Variation in Second Language Acquisition: Discourse and Pragmatics*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 103-125.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and Elite Olshtain 1984. *Request and apologies: A Cross Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns*. *Applied Linguistics* 5: 196-213.
- Braun, Friederike 1988. *Terms of Address*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, H. Douglas 1994. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Third Edition. Englewood. Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman 1960. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity, in: T.A. Sebeok ed. *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press. 235-276.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson 1987. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enomoto, Masatsugu 2001. *Nichieigo hanashi kotoba no onseigaku [Phonetics of English and Japanese Speech Sounds]*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University.
- Finegan, Edward 1999. *Language*. Third Edition. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Horwitz, Elaine K., Horwitz, Michael B. and Cope, Jo Ann 1986. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety, *The Modern Language Journal* 70:125-132.
- Jakobson, Roman 1960. Linguistics and Poetics, in: T.A. Sebeok ed. *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press. 350-369.
- Jernudd, Bjorn H. 1994. Personal Names and Human Rights, in: T. Skutnabb-Kangas and R. Phillipson, eds. *Linguistic Human Rights*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 121-132.
- Labov, William 1984. Intensity, in: D. Schiffrin ed. *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics*, Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 43-70.
- Lado, Robert 1957. *Linguistics Across Culture*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press
- Kreidler, Charles W. 1989. *The pronunciation of English*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Kubozono, Haruo 1999. Mora and Syllable, in N. Tsujimura ed. *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, Oxford: Blackwell. 31-61.
- Leech, Geoffrey 1999. The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English, in H. Hasselgard and S. Okseffjell, eds. *Out of Corpora*, Amsterdam: Rodopi. 107-120.
- Lakoff, George and Zoltán Kövecses 1987. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English, in: D. Holland and N. Quinn, eds. *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 195-222.
- McDonough, Steve H. 1986. *Psychology in Foreign Language Teaching*. Second Edition. London: Allen & Unwin.
- MacIntyre, Peter D. & Robert C. Gardner 1991. Methods and Results in Study of Anxiety and Language Learning: A Review of the Literature, *Language Learning* 41:85-117.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2002. *Linguistic Emotivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ochs, Elinor and Bambi B. Schieffelin 1989. Language has a heart. *Text* 9: 7-25.
- Oyetade, Solomon O. 1995. A Sociolinguistic Analysis of address forms in Yoruba, *Language in Society* 24: 515-535.
- Searle, John 1972 [1965]. What is a Speech Act? in: P. P. Giglioli ed. *Language and Social Context*, Harmondsworth: Penguin. 136-155.
- Taniguchi, Yuko 1994. Address Forms: Another Socio-Affective Variable in EFL Classroom. Presented at TESOL 94, Baltimore.
- Taniguchi, Yuko 1996. Anxiety in Classroom Interaction: A Case of Address Forms. Presented at TESOL 96, Chicago.
- Verschueren, Jef 2001. Pragmatics, in: P. Cobley ed. *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, London: Routledge. 83-94.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald 1970. The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, *TESOL Quarterly* 4:123-130
- Wierzbicka, Anna 1992. *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, Henry 1996. *Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

<i>Italics</i>	the use of an address form focussed on e.g. <i>Makiko</i>
ma.KI.ko	CAPITAL shows stress: stress on KI, Næ, O (note: stress mentioned here is relative)
Næ.o.mi	
næ.O.mi	

'utterance'	utterance in Japanese
('utterance')	translation into English
[.]	syllable boundary
()	information about interaction
.	indicates sentence-final intonation
?	indicates rising intonation
...	noticeable pause
.....	longer pause (more than about 3 seconds)
[]	brackets between two lines show overlap
=	to the right or left of an utterance indicates continuation
Names	names appearing in the data except Naomi and Makiko remain anonymous.

Janie Beswick: The Portuguese diaspora in Jersey
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
93-105
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Janie Beswick and the Editors, 2005

The Portuguese diaspora in Jersey

Janie Beswick

*University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
jb4@soton.ac.uk*

Abstract

This present paper concerns recent migrations from the Portuguese mainland and from the island of Madeira to the English and French speaking territory of Jersey, the largest of the Channel Islands. On-going research is being carried out with a group of students from the Jersey community and studying at the University of Southampton. Through a series of informal discussions and class participation exercises, a detailed evaluation of both behavioural and attitudinal evidence pertaining to these languages in context is carried out. Moreover, the students own observations about their home community's sociolinguistic network and notions of identity afford a valuable insight into the hierarchical and attitudinal factors which determine the interpersonal communication strategies employed on a day-to-day basis. To this end, tentative conclusions are made regarding the ethnolinguistic vitality of the younger members of this particular community.

Introduction

The movement of peoples across the globe is not a new phenomenon. In the past, new lands were discovered and indigenous populations were, ultimately, subjugated by the more powerful invaders. Thus, for example, the Romans voyaged to the Iberian Peninsula, conquered and colonised the territory and, as the politically dominant ethnic group, imposed their vernacular on the native populations, what Mar-Molinero terms an imposed 'top-down' colonising process (2003: 3). However, contemporary globalisation processes facilitate a different type of migration, that of individuals and small groups in search not of new territory, but of economic stability. The resultant and hitherto unfamiliar linguistic and sociocultural contact between a particular diaspora and the host community may greatly affect both behavioural and attitudinal factors regarding language use. Indeed, most if not all host nation-states around the world have, sometimes simply for essentially pragmatic reasons, required that immigrant minority communities learn the national language. As a consequence, such communities tend to become integrated over time as their idiosyncratic linguistic, social and cultural identities are subsumed into the framework of the dominant society – again, what Mar-Molinero terms a 'bottom-up' infiltrating phenomenon (2003: 3).

In recent times, two diametrically opposed views pertaining to the effects of globalisation on linguistic diversity have come to the fore, prompted by the ever-increasing authority and role in migration of global languages such as English and espoused by the migrants themselves as a fundamental key to improving their lot. Proponents of benevolent nationalisms claim that

such integration processes eradicate ethnic division and the marginalisation of minority groups by the dominant community, whereas antiassimilationists argue that the loss of linguistic and cultural diversity has a profoundly negative effect on the minority community and its perception of ethnicity.¹ Both opinions are eminently valid, but it can be somewhat counter-productive to generalise in this way about the effects of integration and segregation processes. Before the emergence of a transnational perspective, the study of immigration tended to assume that by consciously breaking their ties with their *madre patria*, all migrants committed themselves to being acculturated and assimilated into the new society.² Nevertheless, recent research tends to demonstrate that such migrants can maintain long-lasting ties with their homelands, and consequently, they 'carry' an internalised identity with them, one that is rooted in their ethnic, cultural and social background. This identity then, may transcend the national boundary, and resurface, sometimes years later, as the catalyst for the resurgence of a collective ethnic loyalty, such as that which has happened to a large extent with US Latinos. Fox points out that a sense of community, of sharing values, speech patterns and customs is the overriding factor in the self-conceptualisation of such identities (1996: 2-3). Thus, identity is a fluid concept, shaped by circumstance. So although the Latinos in the USA may not share a common origin, their quest is bound by a common language and tradition. Thus, by enacting a consensual change in attitude, they are able to forge a new, collective identity to which they demonstrate affiliation.³

Fairly long-standing communities may already be reasonably well integrated into the host society. Consider for example the Poles in the UK. The very fact that the host society does not marginalise or discriminate against them (ostensibly at the very least) affords them the opportunity to express and reinforce their identity, without fear of reprisal, by the use of their mother tongue.⁴ Such communities underline Hidalgo's important point that bilingual, bicultural groups tend to result from such contact situations, and that, on the one hand, failure to adjust to the majority culture together with a sense of rejection by its members, and on the other hand, rapid assimilation to the host culture concurrent with an abandonment of idiosyncratic traits - including language - are the two extremes (2001: 61-62).

Portuguese Migratory Patterns

One particular transnational migration of the twentieth century afforded little consideration until now is that which occurred in the mid twentieth century from the Portuguese island of Madeira to the English and French speaking territory of Jersey. The present paper will present the results of an initial piece of research recently carried out with a group of students at the University of Southampton, all of whom are from the Jersey Portuguese-speaking community, whose mother tongue is Portuguese but who are all competent English speakers and are reading for degrees in language studies.

Portuguese is the official language of over 200 million people globally.⁵ However, it is also spoken by a large number of disparate communities around the world in countries where

¹ For a further discussion, see Beswick (forthcoming) and in particular, the University of Warwick's working papers on globalisation at <http://www.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/CSGR/index.html>.

² See for example Levitt (2000).

³ Anderson famously terms such groups 'imagined communities' (1991: 5-6).

⁴ However, see in particular, the article on the Polish community by Muir in *Multilingualism in the British Isles* (1991: 143-156.)

⁵ The most up-to-date population statistics are to be found on the CIA website entitled the World Factbook 2002, at www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html. Current figures for Portuguese-speaking nations are:

Portugal is not officially recognised, hence official statistics do not take these communities into account. One such community is that of Jersey.

The traditional migratory pattern associated with Portugal has long been one of movement away from Portugal and towards other countries, rather than from overseas to Portugal. Portugal was once the head of a great Empire, famed for its affinity with the sea and its territorial discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Thus began the deep-seated and long-standing custom, motivated in the first instance by colonial aspirations, of emigration away from the homeland to the new territorial possessions of the Empire. However, in more recent times, these migratory patterns have been prompted more by economic rather than political factors. During the nineteenth century and indeed, until the beginning of the 1960s, this emigration was predominately to Brazil and other Latin American countries (Rocha-Trindade 1985: 20; López Trigal 2001: 344), although emigration to the USA also began in the nineteenth century. Between 1950 and 1976, some 141,906 Portuguese emigrated to the USA, with some 103,408 going to Canada (Guerreiro 1981: 41).

For much of the twentieth century, the paternalistic, highly conservative Salazar/Caetano dictatorship succeeded in dragging the Portuguese economy backwards instead of encouraging it to develop, achieve its potential and even emulate that of other countries within western Europe. As a consequence, many Portuguese labourers, particularly those from the more rural areas, could not find work and had no choice but to go abroad. Initially, many went to France or Germany to work as itinerant agricultural labour. The majority were not granted work permits but they were able to earn enough so as to be able to send back most of their wages to their families in Portugal. Although the Portuguese regime never openly supported this exodus of the manual workforce, nor did they ever appear to condemn it. Indeed, Eaton goes so far as to claim that such exports of human labour were ‘structural and symbolic’ features of Portuguese society at that time (1999: 365). Moreover, by the early 1970s, it is estimated that the Portuguese economy was being shored up by the not inconsiderable £ 400 million a year external income. European emigration peaked during the final years of the Salazar/Caetano dictatorship. During the last decade, more than one million people - a tenth of the population - emigrated, and between 1970 and 1974 alone, between 610,000 - 630,000 nationals left the country both legally and clandestinely (Guerreiro 1981: 33; Eaton 1999: 365).

López Trigal summarises diverse data pertaining to the Portuguese within Europe (2001: 344-345). For example, data compiled by the *Instituto de Apoio à Emigração* estimate that 4.47 million Portuguese were resident outside Portugal in the mid-1990s, and France is ranked as having the highest number of Portuguese-speaking inhabitants in Europe, with over 400,000 having relocated there, both legally and illegally, between 1950 and 1976 alone. Moreover, Spain ranks fourth after Switzerland and Germany respectively, with the *Anuario de Migraciones* supplying the official figure of 38,316 Portuguese resident in Spain

Portugal	10 million
Brazil	176 million
Mozambique	19.6 million
Angola	10.5 million
Guinea Bissau	1.2 million
East Timor	0.9 million
Cabo Verde	0.4 million
São Tomé & Príncipe	0.16 million

There appear to be no official estimates for Goa, Damão, Diu (India), but Winn quotes the official population of Macau at 0.37 million (2000: 496).

in 1996. According to the 1992 Luxembourg census, well over 10% of the 399,000 inhabitants are of Portuguese origin and finally, further afield, there may be as many as 500,000 first-language Portuguese speakers resident in South Africa, mainly due to the exodus of Angolan and Mozambican nationals after the colonial wars of the 1970s (Winn 2000: 496).

Since the overthrow of the dictatorship in 1974, there has been a considerable drop in the total rate of Portuguese emigration, however figures differ widely. Guerreiro registers a huge reduction in both legal and clandestine emigration between 1973 and 1977 (-76%) (1981: 46) as does Eaton (1999: 365), based on Eurostat figures, for the period 1986 – 1996.⁶ This is partly due to more favourable living conditions at home and partly to the slowing down of opportunities abroad, especially in Germany and France where saturation point in the number of immigrant ‘guest workers’ who could be absorbed into their economies was reached by the early 1970s (Insight Team 1975: 68). As a consequence, perhaps as many as 300,000 *regressos* have returned to live in Portugal (Eaton 1999: 365). Simultaneously, there has been a radical change in migratory patterns within Portugal itself. Immigration has been consistently growing since the 1980s; between 1985 – 1995 for example, the foreign community in Portugal almost doubled in size (Eaton 1999: 366).

For the first emigrants to the USA, Canada and South America, leaving Portugal was felt to be definitive and the notion of geographical space paramount. As Hidalgo points out for the case of Mexican communities in the US, the significance of language and ethnicity within a diaspora tends to decrease in accordance with an increase in the distance from the country of origin of the speakers concerned (2001: 61). Moreover, their desire and attempts to build better lives for themselves and their families necessitated at the very least that they overlooked their Portuguese ethnic identity. In their conscious and concerted efforts to integrate with the host culture through acculturation and assimilation processes in order to adopt the host vernacular, social norms and customs they were required to abandon to a large extent their natives ones. On the other hand, in the twentieth century, as Europe started to open up to Portuguese emigration – and indeed, to emigration from other countries - an ostensibly different type of migrant appears to have emerged. European migrants had one overriding intention; to return home once they had amassed enough savings to be able to do so. Typically, tight-knit communities sprang up throughout Europe, where, in this case, the Portuguese could maintain a sense of community identity. Thus, they continued to interact in their native language, they established community organizations, social centres, shops, clubs etc. in order to avoid mixing with the host society.⁷

Initially, such European emigration patterns were in stark contrast to those witnessed in the Americas.⁸ However, it would be somewhat foolish to imagine that these patterns have not be somewhat attenuated by the effects of globalisation, for changes in the notion of geographical space, that is, the greater proximity and accessibility to homelands offered by advances such as in transportation are transforming the relationship the immigrant has both with their host country and with their own sense of identity (Mar Molinero, forthcoming). Thus, Portuguese migrants in the USA and Canada can now visit Portugal and maintain

⁶ See Trigal for a comparison of the disparate estimates pertaining to Portuguese emigrants in Spain for the period 1986 – 1993 (2001: 344).

⁷ See Birmingham for an excellent description of this type of Portuguese emigration (1999: 171-173) and once again, the excellent collection of papers on migrant communities within the UK entitled *Multilingualism in the British Isles* (1991).

⁸ See in this respect, Mayone Dias (1987).

contact with their roots and hence, with their 'other' identity even though reinforcement of these links may prevent total assimilation into the host community, at least for the older members of the group. Moreover, Portuguese emigrants such as those in France, continue to defend their language and culture through organizations and associations, but, since the initial return in the 1970s, may no longer feel the need to return to their roots. Rather, Portuguese diaspora in contemporary Europe are tending to settle within and integrate with the host community more than ever before (López Trigal 2001: 346). As far as the younger generations are concerned, it would appear that at least in the USA and Canada, many tend to reject the adult's attempts to maintain such contacts, social norms and identities.⁹

Recent Research

A significant amount of research on immigration into Portugal has been carried out in the last twenty or so years, but studies on the extent of Portuguese migration globally are also fairly widely available.¹⁰ Valuable work has recently been carried out on the largest Portuguese diasporic communities in Europe, such as the surveys by Andreas Klimt on the Portuguese diaspora in Germany (2000a; 2000b), and on Portuguese diaspora in the USA and in particular, Canada, such as Alpalhão and da Rosa (1983) in Quebec, Cummins (1991) on Portuguese-speaking children in Ontario, Canada and more recently, a collection of papers on communities in Canada as a whole edited by Teixeira and da Rosa (2000).

However, the degree to which research has been carried out on the vitality of Portuguese-speaking communities in the UK is in no way extensive. Although the Linguistic Minorities Project (1985) and Santarita and Martin-Jones' more contemporary research (1991) both examine Portuguese diaspora throughout the UK, only the latter give any mention, and a brief one at that, to emigration from Madeira to the Channel Islands. Instead, most work has been focused upon the far greater numbers who are from mainland Portugal and Brazil and, to a lesser extent, from the former Portuguese colonies in Africa.¹¹ Notwithstanding this and somewhat importantly for the aims of this paper, they state that in the late 1980s, there were about three thousand Madeirans resident in the Islands as a whole, plus a further five thousand seasonal workers with six month work permits (Santarita and Martin-Jones 1991: 230).

Similarly, research on the ethnic composition of the Channel Islands is also scant. Indeed, little has been written of any significance regarding the social or political history of the Islands since the mid 1960s.¹² Even in the latest tourist guides, no mention is made of the Portuguese community and in academic publications on Portuguese migration, Portuguese emigration to the Islands is not discussed, if alluded to at all in the figures. This is perhaps somewhat understandable, given that emigration to the Islands from Madeira only began to any extent in the 1950s, although there is some debate as to when the first major influx occurred in Jersey. According to figures compiled by José Guerreiro, the then Secretary of State for Portuguese Emigration, between 1950–1976, some 104,769 people emigrated from Madeira (the total for Portugal as a whole was 1,325, 913) (1981: 40). Between 1965 and

⁹ See in this respect, Almeida 1(2000).

¹⁰ See Corkhill (1996), Engerman (1997), Baganha (1998), Eaton (1998, 1999) re immigration patterns; Rocha-Trindade (1982), Alpalhão and da Rosa (1983), Arroiteia (1983), Ferreira (1984) on emigration.

¹¹ For example, Lucia Winn's recent investigation focuses upon the Portuguese-speaking communities resident in London (2000: 495-505).

¹² It would appear that the Channel Islands are somewhat out of fashion; apart from George Forty's recent books on the German occupation, there is little more contemporary than Hooke (1953) and Uttley (1966).

1978, the majority of these emigrants went to Venezuela, but it is unclear how many of the 3,820 listed under 'other countries' ended up in some part of the UK and by definition, the Channel Islands.¹³

The period 1950–1959 appears to be the most important as far as emigration from Madeira is concerned (Guerreiro 1981: 47). By then, both the Madeiran and Azorean economies, based primarily on subsistence farming, were being stultified, and much of the workforce was living on the breadline. The Channel Islands too, have a long tradition of subsistence farming (the main crops being potatoes and tomatoes) and, albeit to a much lesser degree, fishing. From the end of the nineteenth century until just after the Second World War, Jersey in particular had relied on Breton (and to a lesser extent, Irish) seasonal labourers to work the land, and quite a number had become tenants of farms or even owners, buying property in the name of Jersey-born wives and children to overcome the restriction on alien ownership of land, which decrees that non-British born subject cannot hold real estate (Channel Islands Study Group 1944: 5).

In the post-war period, legal reform enabled Jersey's economy to undergo a huge growth period. As a result, more investment opportunities were created; in particular, the tourist industry, which had started to grow before the War, expanded rapidly. Indeed, the number of visitors to Jersey alone rose to above 500,000 in 1964 (Uttley 1966: 215). As a consequence of this boom period, Jersey needed yet again to strengthen its manual labour force, and this time it was the turn of the Madeirans. Most of the emigrants, as was typically the case in other parts of the world (Trigal 2001: 346), were unqualified and unskilled labourers from rural agricultural sectors, who arrived in Jersey to work in catering, hotels, hospitals, domestic work and the agricultural sector. Up until the early 1990s, they were only allowed in on six monthly renewable work permits, but the entry of Portugal into the EU in the late 1980s and its subsequent acquisition of full membership in 1992 has rendered their legal position with respect to employment law more tenable.

Portuguese Ethnolinguistic Vitality in Jersey

In order to carry out my initial research into the Portuguese community living on Jersey, I elicited the aid of five of my students, all of whom have Portuguese as their mother tongue but who are, to one extent or another, competent English speakers. In my capacity as Convenor of Portuguese Studies they believed that I was interested in finding out about their backgrounds to see whether we could attract more of them to the University. As they are extremely aware of their status within Jersey itself, being used somewhat at guinea pigs in secondary school for the pilot scheme in Portuguese teaching, they were more than happy to share their experiences, thoughts and ideas about their community. Through the use of general debates and conversations, both within group seminars and individually over a coffee, we were able to have a series of frank and open informal discussions about oral and written proficiencies, linguistic group membership and attitudinal factors. However, the students' main observations about their home community's sociolinguistic network and notions of identity were also gleaned by self-reporting techniques, using a set of questions to elicit data which would afford an insight into the hierarchical and attitudinal factors which determine the interpersonal communication strategies employed.

¹³ According to the 1991 population census, officially there were 13,125 Portugal nationals in Greater London, however the figure may have been more like 50,000 throughout the UK: Winn calculates that in the 1990s there were at least 30,000 Portuguese first, second and third generation speakers in Greater London alone (2000: 496).

In employing both self-reporting techniques and behavioural observations by the researcher, it was hoped that the present study would avoid the potential pitfalls inherent within either procedure. Thus, the students were offered the opportunity articulate the attitudes they wanted to profess as their own, such as the desire to hide or enhance their ethnic origins or even a exaggerate or deny their linguistic competence. These were then compared with performance features.¹⁴

The following is a general summary of the results of this study. Whilst they are to no degree entirely categorical, they do appear to reinforce the premise that to a degree, identity is a fluid concept, that the sense of belonging to a particular ethnic group and the use of language as a way of expressing such membership may change, not only over time as Klimt has found in Germany (2000a: 259), but also according to other factors. This is verified by the differing responses offered by the students, which were to a large extent commensurate with their particular social circumstances, such as the place of birth, place of residence etc.. In every case, the parents of these students went to Jersey in search of economic stability. The Portuguese community established itself in an area of St Helier and the surrounding suburbs, continued to interact in their native language, and established community organizations, social centres, shops and clubs. However, whereas SR and JM were subsequently born there, and VB moved from mainland Portugal to Jersey with her parents at the age of six, SA and ST were born in Madeira and remained living there with relatives until the age of eleven. They then moved to Jersey to be with their parents who were already working there as, variously, tenant farmers, farm labourer, cleaner and shop assistant. Such distinctions in early home life are an important factor in the selection of group identity parameters, for the students appear to associate with their place of birth rather than with the nationality of their parents. For example, SA states, "I am Madeiran"; VB similarly claims she is Portuguese; whilst SR consciously selects a British identity and initially, totally rejects the notion that she could be considered anything else. These respondents then, appear to maintain deep-seated ties with their homelands when defined as their place of birth. Thus, their internalised identity appears to be rooted in the ethnic, cultural and social background fashioned in their formative childhood years. However, JM's responses present an extremely clear case of the fluidity of identity which can be shaped by particular circumstances, for he has recently applied, and received, Portuguese nationality. He claims that doing a degree in Portuguese and spending time in a strong Portuguese environment for a year (he was in Lisbon) have been the defining factors and the catalyst for his proud application for dual nationality.

Place of residence also appears to reinforce the idea of group identity. Both SA and ST's families live in farm property, within the geographical demarcation (according to their definitions) of the Portuguese community. As a consequence, all of their neighbours and most of their family friends are Portuguese. However, VB claims not to live within the Portuguese community, as her parents run a hotel away from the main towns. Finally, JM and SR have lived on Jersey all their lives surrounded by predominately "English" neighbours (SR). She then asserts that "there are some Portuguese families nearby", clearly differentiating between the two ethnic groups but not, at this point, associating unequivocally with either.

SR makes clearer declarations regarding the way she perceives her own identity when discussing the use of language as a potential reinforcer of ethnicity. For all the respondents, the language which shaped their early home life is Portuguese, however SR insists that

¹⁴ It has to be said that in very few cases, did it appear that the respondents were expressing anything less than their true feelings about the various components of the survey.

although this is true, she went to a British nursery school and outside nursery hours, she was always looked after with a group of English children. As a consequence, she claims that from a very early age she already spoke English outside the home “better than I spoke Portuguese”. Such assertions could be viewed as an attempt to disassociate herself from the Portuguese collective. Of all the respondents, SR in particular appears to be uncomfortable with the notion of Portuguese ethnicity. Even though she claims to now feeling passionate about being both British and Portuguese, she admits that this is partially to do with completing a degree in Portuguese and realising that she her multifaceted ethnic background is not a source of shame. Still, she admits she does not really feel either is her true nationality.¹⁵

The discourse of the other respondents is indicative of their perceptions regarding attitudes to, and uses of, Portuguese within the confines of their families and indeed, within the wider Portuguese community, as a clear reinforcer of identity. All the respondents state that their parents at the very least always use Portuguese with them, even if one of them inadvertently says something in English. Indeed, JM says that his father still does not understand much English. His mother insists that he never speaks English to Portuguese people; he quotes her as saying “Portuguese is your heritage - so use it”. VB states that as she and her family are Portuguese, it would feel wrong to speak English with them. ST agrees, adding that as only Portuguese is spoken between family members, principally because her family do not speak English very well, English “doesn’t sound right or natural”. SA is even more vehement. She refuses to talk English to her family, adding that she hates talking English to other people in front of her parents and hides from them if an English-speaking friend phones her. She is extremely vociferous on this point, appraising the language behaviour of, and in particular, the use of English by Portuguese-speaking relatives as a betrayal or rejection of their ethnicity and quite clearly displaying strong ties with her internalised Madeiran identity.¹⁶

Within the wider Portuguese community, the respondent’s use of language appears to correspond to a large extent with their intuitive needs to reinforce their alliance to a given ethnic group. Thus, patterns of usage range from Portuguese all the time, irrespective of the interlocutor’s reply, to being dictated to by the interlocutor’s selection of code, to a determined use of English unless the interlocutor insists on speaking Portuguese. Once again, the two Madeiran respondents were the most voluble regarding the behaviour of other members of the community who appear to reject their identity by rejecting the use of Portuguese in inter-group interactions.

As far as integration into and acculturation with the host society are concerned, all the respondents feel extremely comfortable in the presence of English speakers irrespective of their place of birth and attitudes towards their own notion of belonging. Moreover, there was a certain amount of consternation and awkwardness displayed regarding the mother tongue employed by and with their friends. The fact that most of their friends are native English speakers naturally implies that they speak with them, as SA asserts, “in their language”. Yet,

¹⁵ A similar situation was encountered with the respondent María in previous research on code-switching phenomena in Galicia. See Beswick (1998: 63).

¹⁶ SA was extremely disparaging about an aunt who insisted on talking to her in English “even though she doesn’t speak it fluently”. Her aunt insists because she says Jersey is “an English Island” and that if people want to speak Portuguese then they should go back to Portugal – in fact, that would be good as “there are too many Portuguese here working in the shops”. SA always replies to her aunt in Portuguese “which I know really does annoy her”, adding that “some Portuguese feel like that, they have been on Jersey a few years and ...so think that they **are** English ... which is ridiculous”. JM has a similar story to tell, claiming that this type of behaviour also annoys him.

the situation is more complicated with their Portuguese-speaking friends. SR and JM would tend to use English anyway, JM stating “once you speak in English, you can’t go back” as justification of his selection of language and reinforcing the notion that English is the dominant language for these two respondents. For the others, issues such as interlocutor competence, language employed at the first encounter, and topic of the discourse also come into play. Although they tended to employ English within the school environment, all added that nowadays the situation is not as clear-cut. For example, when swapping pieces of gossip and general chitchat, they tend to use Portuguese, primarily as it feels more “natural”, but also, in certain environments, so that the conversation can be private. However, when discussing classes, or events enacted originally in English, this is the code they would switch to. SA adds that when with a mixed group of friends, she will speak both languages if the Portuguese-speakers do not speak good English. ST claims linguistic and ethnic allegiance with her closest friends in that they are “in the same situation as me”; that is, native Portuguese speakers who have come to live in an English-speaking setting. Thus, she nearly always speaks Portuguese with them. However, all agreed that with their brothers, sisters and cousins who live in Jersey, English tends to predominate when they are not amongst other family members. The justification offered was that as they all attended a British schools and been taught in English, it would somehow be strange to talk to each other in Portuguese, but again, issues pertaining to the topic and domain of the discourse mean that the functional demarcation between the two languages in question is starting, at least in the younger generations, to be somewhat blurred at times.¹⁷

Finally, all admit to a degree of code- mixing when talking Portuguese, viewing it with negative connotations as sign of laziness or as a mistake when they cannot immediately think of the appropriate Portuguese word. For example, ST adds that she sometimes also mixes and switches between languages for emphasis as “some things sound better in one language than in the other”, such as ‘oh my God’ and ‘bless’, even if she is talking to her parents.

¹⁷ In the latter part of the twentieth century, the Portuguese government adopted a policy of language maintenance to attend to the children of emigrants and migrant workers abroad (Winn 2000), paying their wages and providing educational literature to the schools in question. In order to evaluate the situation on Jersey, a letter requesting information regarding the provision and support, if any, for intra- or extra-curricula Portuguese classes for native speakers was sent to the ten secondary schools and further education colleges on Jersey. As elsewhere in the UK, Jersey has a certain amount of provision for the teaching of GCSE Portuguese to the children of Portuguese migrants. Moreover, there has been of late an increase in institutional support for the dissemination and promotion of Portuguese, and in conjunction with the Portuguese Consul, schools are now encouraged to offer a certain amount of language support to new arrivals from Portugal who may speak no English. Moreover, the respondents knew that news bulletins are broadcast once a day in Portuguese on the television.

Of the replies received (eight), five of the institutions do offer Portuguese classes in one form or another in the form of small adult education classes to non-native speakers such as members of staff, parents and some students, and run on an experimental voluntary basis by a non-native member of staff. In the three state schools offering GCSE Portuguese, the classes take place after regular school hours and outside the mainstream curriculum and are run by Portuguese native speakers and only offered to pupils with Portuguese backgrounds. One school has ten pupils sitting it this year; the other schools did not mention numbers although one adds that some 5% of their student population either are from Madeira or are second-generation Portuguese speakers. Finally, one school offers AS level Portuguese and also has an A level class, although at present there are few students.

These general findings would appear to correspond well with my respondents’ experiences of studying Portuguese on Jersey. All had after school Portuguese classes once a week but these classes appear not to be as successful as would be hoped. Two expressed grave concerns regarding the teachers; SA was often criticised by them for having a Madeiran accent, and VB was totally demotivated and rarely turned up as she felt she wasn’t learning anything, yet all managed to achieve high grades in the exam.

All also did A level Portuguese, and agreed that overall, it was more organised, particularly as the classes were intra curriculum.

Commonly, nouns such as ‘knife’, ‘shop’, ‘door’, ‘flat’, ‘bus’ are inserted into a Portuguese dialogue but subject to the Portuguese phonetic system, such as:

eu gosto de comer o meu breakfast as 7 horas da manha
‘I like to eat my breakfast at 7 in the morning’
eu vou ao shop
‘I’m going to the shop’
tenho aqui um knife
‘I have a knife’

Language preference

One of the most illuminating discussions pertaining to issues of identity was that concerning language preference. We have already seen that the relationship between language use and ethnic identity may not be straightforward. Indeed, the latter does not always necessarily coincide with the language of regular use. Rather, the relationship between the two may be one of association, for symbolic, tokenist reasons such as Edward (1984) claims is the case in Ireland and as Hoare (2000) claims may be at least partially the case in Brittany.

As far as this study is concerned, the fact that English has played such a dominant role as the language of instruction has had a clear impact on the respondents’ overall linguistic competence. All the respondents admit to feeling, to varying degrees, more comfortable and find it easier to express their viewpoints, in English. SA adds that she only prefers English as she thinks that her Portuguese is not very good, and the other respondents voiced similar notions of insecurity regarding their competence in Portuguese.¹⁸ Yet, all bar SR constantly back up these assertions with statements such as “but of course, I really love Portuguese” (ST), “I am very much Portuguese” (VB); “I am Portuguese through and through” (SA). These three respondents also qualified their statements by adding that they would be extremely happy never to have to use English again; indeed, one of the prime motivations for doing degrees in Portuguese was to improve their competence to such an extent that they would be able to relocate to a Portuguese-speaking country to work. ST was the most vociferous, stating “I don’t really think that there is much English about me apart from the fact that I am here (in England). I like my Portuguese food, I like my Portuguese family, I like my Portuguese friends, I love Madeira, I am very proud of being from where I am, so yeah, I think I am Portuguese”. Once again, this is a clear manifestation of the maintenance by recent migrants of deep-seated ties with their ethnic, social and cultural roots, evinced more by her strong statements than by an overriding determination, at least for the time being, to use Portuguese at all costs.¹⁹

Conclusion

It must be emphasised that this project is in its infancy, therefore I make no far-reaching claims for the results I have indicated above. However, there are some valuable comments to

¹⁸ In point of fact, all the respondents without exception speak perfectly clear, grammatically correct Portuguese, without the trace of an English accent.

¹⁹ Interestingly, none of the respondents used Portuguese in our sessions, even though I initiated the conversations in Portuguese.

be made based upon certain tendencies which have arisen and which will be explored further once the project is expanded.

According to the respondents of this study, it would appear that the Portuguese community of Jersey remains fairly close-knit and for the majority older residents at the very least, demonstrated by the reported behaviour of family members, Portuguese continues to be the main language of the home and of intra-group communication.

The findings correspond fairly well to those of other research into Portuguese diasporic communities eg Santarita and Martin-Jones' study on the London community (1991: 234). However, unlike their finding of a non-reciprocal pattern of language choice, the present study reveals a Portuguese/Portuguese pattern. Thus, it would seem that here, the language itself is used as an emblematic reinforcing and unifying symbol of group identity by the diaspora at the same time as the younger generations at the very least acquire a notion of Britishness at school and learn the host community's language. Such communities underline Hidalgo's important point that bilingual, bicultural groups tend to be the general outcome of contact situations between two disparate societies (2001: 61-62). However, we should bear in mind the limitations of respondent numbers, and the fact that this community has only been established for a short period of time. It may be that ultimately, the language of the peer group and school may start to be employed in the home as the children become acculturated.

Santarita and Martin-Jones also found that the younger Portuguese in London had evolved a distinctive code-switching arrangement that developed into a characteristic discourse pattern in order to give voice to their bilingual and bicultural identity (1991: 234). Conversely however, López Trigal found that in Portuguese-speaking communities in Spain the use of *portunhol* as the *lingua franca* in intragroup interactions, that is, code-mixing, devalued their own origins and identity and self-esteem (2001: 350). Our study reveals similar findings however nearly all the respondents undermine and undervalue their ability in Portuguese and claim that this is sometimes why they have to code-switch.

The representatives of the Portuguese diaspora in Jersey selected for this study demonstrate how attitudes towards issues of ethnic identity can differ within the same generation circumstances. There is evidence that place of birth influences the degree of acculturation and assimilation with the host society, for the three respondents born in Madeira and Portugal have maintained the strongest association with their native language, culture and ethnic identity within the diaspora, and declare their intentions to eventually live and work in a Portuguese-speaking country. Note however, that perhaps as a result of globalisation, their sense of belonging encompasses a greater definition of ethnicity than that of their homelands, yet again denoted by the language as a symbol of this communal identity. Yet Portuguese as the mother tongue does not necessarily lead to a process of individual and aggregative self-definition and self-realization. The immersion of the Jersey-born respondents within the host society from birth appears to have had an effect on at least one of their perceptions of group membership. Although the maintenance of mother tongue at pre-school age and parental cooperation is important as it contributes to first language proficiency, for this respondent, this did not mean that she felt Portuguese. Her strong preference for English, coupled with her need to be accepted socially by the host community has not yet led to the total loss of her own cultural distinctiveness, but does account to some extent for her stated ambivalence regarding her ethnicity.

In addition, membership of an ethnic group appears to be fluid to a certain extent, in that at times, the demarcation between the use of Portuguese and Madeiran by the respective respondents is not entirely explicit. Moreover, the other Jersey respondent has reaffirmed his Portuguese identity by acquiring dual nationality, and now refers proudly to himself as both British and Portuguese.²⁰ Moreover, ethnic identity within a community such as this one can be considered motivated by self in a given situation; you can feel a group member in certain situations but not others.

Finally, it would appear that language preference and mother tongue are not necessarily contiguous, that the respondents' perception of their group membership is not totally reliant on them employing Portuguese in every situation. Rather, at times the relationship between the two does indeed appear to be more for symbolic reasons and once again, the link with a Portuguese ethnic background would appear to be the strong reinforcer of identity.

References

- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
- Almeida, O.T. 1994. Portugal and the Concern with National Identity. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 71, 1: 155-164
- Arroteia, J. 1983. *A Emigração Portuguesa – suas origens e distribuição*. Lisbon: Instituto de Cultura Portuguesa
- Alpalhão, J.A. and V.P. Da Rosa 1983. *Da Emigração à Aculturação. Portugal Insular e Continental no Quebeque*. Angra do Heroísmo: Direcção dos Serviços de Emigração
- Baganha, M.I. 1998. Immigrant Involvement in the Informal Economy: the Portuguese Case. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 24, 2: 367-385
- Balleine, G.R. 1950. *A History of the Island of Jersey: from the Cave Man to the Occupation and after*. London/New York: Staples
- Beswick, J.E. 1998. Observações sobre as actitudes e os comportamentos relativos ós cambios de código en Santiago de Compostela. *Cadernos de Lingua* 18: 53-78
- Beswick, J.E. 2002. Galician Language Planning and Implications for Regional Identity: Restoration or Elimination? *National Identities* 4, 3: 257-272
- Beswick, J.E. forthcoming. *Spanish Regionalism: Ethnic Identity and Language Loyalty in Galicia*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Brettell, C.B. 1993. The Emigrant, the Nation, and the State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Portugal: an Anthropological Approach. *Portuguese Studies Review* 2, 2: 51-65
- Channel Islands Study Group. 1944. *Nos Iles: A Symposium on the Channel Islands*. Middlesex: CISG
- Corkhill, D. 1996. Multiple National Identities, Immigration and Racism in Spain and Portugal, in: B. Jenkins and S.A. Sofos, eds. *Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe*. London: Routledge. 155-171
- Eaton, M. 1998. Foreign Residents and Illegal Immigrants in Portugal. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22, 1: 49-66
- Eaton, M. 1999. Immigration in the 1990s: A Study of the Portuguese Labour Market. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 6, 4: 364-370
- Edwards J. 1984. Irish and English in Ireland, in P. Trudgill, ed. *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 480-499
- Engerman, S.L. and J. C. das Neves. 1997. The Bricks of an Empire 1415 – 1999: 585 Years of Portuguese Emigration. *Journal of European Economic History* 26, 3: 471 – 510
- Ferreira, E.S. 1984. *Reintegração dos Emigrantes Portuguesas – Integração na CEE e Desenvolvimento Económico*. Lisbon: Associação de Estudantes do Instituto Superior de Economia
- Fox, G. 1996. *Hispanic Nation: Culture, Politics and the Constructing of Identity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press
- Guerreiro, J. 1981. Análise Tendencial da Emigração Portuguesa nos Últimos Anos, in M. B. Rocha-Trindade, ed. *Estudos sobre a Emigração Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Sá da Costa Editora. 31-69
- Hidalgo, M. 2001. Spanish Language Shift Reversal on the US-Mexico Border and the Extended Third Space. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 1, 1: 57-75

²⁰ See Beswick (2002: 265-6) regarding the use of prestige factors in the declaration of group membership.

- Hoare, R. 2000. Linguistic Competence and Regional Identity in Brittany: Attitudes and Perceptions of Identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21, 4: 324-345
- Hooke, W.D. 1953. *The Channel Islands*. London: Robert Hale Ltd
- Klimt, A. 2000a. European Space: Portuguese Migrants. Notions of Home and Belonging. *Diaspora* 9, 2: 259 – 286
- Klimt, A. 2000b. Enacting National Selves: Authenticity, Adventure, and Disaffection in the Portuguese Diaspora. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 6,40: 513-550
- Levitt, P. 2000. *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- López Trigal, L. 2001. The Portuguese Community, in M.T. Turell, ed. *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects of Linguistic Minority Groups*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 344-354
- Mar-Molinero, C. forthcoming. Spanish as a World Language: Language and Identity in a Global Era. *Language in Context*. London: Routledge
- Mayone Dias, E. 1987. América e Europa: Duas Maneiras de Estar na Emigração. *Peregrinação* 6, 16: 14-18
- Oliveira, S.M. de. 2002. Discourses of Identity at the Spanish/Portuguese Border: Self-Identification Strategies of Centre and Periphery. *National Identities* 4, 3: 245-256
- Rocha-Trindade, M.B. 1982. *Da Emigração às Comunidades Portuguesas*. Lisbon: Ed. Conhecer
- Santarita, P. and M. Martin-Jones 1991. The Portuguese Speech Community, in S. Alladina, V. Edwards, eds. *Multilingualism in the British Isles I: the Older Mother Tongues and Europe*. London and New York: Longman. 228-240
- Serrão, J. 1977. *A Emigração Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte
- Teixeira C. and V. M. P. da Rosa, eds. 2000. *The Portuguese In Canada: From The Sea to the City*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Uttley, J. 1966. *The Story of the Channel Islands*. London: Faber and Faber
- Winn, L. 2000. Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Portuguese-speaking Communities in London, in P.W. Thomas and J. Matthias, eds. *Developing Minority Languages. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Minority Languages, July 1993*. Cardiff: Gomer Press. 495-505

Matthew H. Ciscel: Language and identity in post-Soviet Moldova
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
106-119
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Matthew H. Ciscel and the Editors, 2005

Language and identity in post-Soviet Moldova¹

Matthew H. Ciscel

Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT, USA
ciscelm@ccsu.edu

Abstract

The multilingual Republic of Moldova emerged from the Soviet Union between 1989 and 1991 as an example of the linguistic complications that can result from imperial domination and the mobility associated with political change. The study draws on historical, survey, and ethnographic data to illustrate the complexity of the accessible language and social identities in the emergent country. Among the issues discussed are the status of Russian, the argument over the status of Moldovan as an independent language or a dialect of Romanian, and the role of English as an international language in Moldova's globalizing culture and economy. Trends in the survey data are both reinforced and challenged by the ethnographic data. In conclusion, I argue that the linguistic identity crisis in Moldova seems far from resolution, even though some reasons for hope can be identified.

Introduction

This study investigates the crisis in linguistic and national identity that affects the multilingual Republic of Moldova. About two-thirds of Moldovans speak a dialect of Romanian that has been highly politicized in recent history. Focusing on the contentious arguments over their linguistic identity both during and after the Soviet period, I argue that the persistent notion of a separate Moldovan language is rooted both in an ancient Moldovanism that predates nineteenth-century Romanian nation-building and in Moscow's exploitation of this identity during the Soviet era. Survey data that illustrates the balanced status of Romanian/Moldovan and Russian in the country today provide a connection between Moldova's troubled past and its present identity crisis.

The connection between linguistic and national identities has been a common theme in the sociolinguistic investigation of nation-building and nationalism. Joshua Fishman's (1973) essays on this topic serve as the field's seminal works. However, ideas and theories related to this topic have been carried off in many directions: polemical, philosophical, empirical, ethnographic,

¹ The fieldwork that led to this study was partially supported by the Title VIII Combined Research and Language Training Program, which is funded by the State Department of the United States of America and administered by the American Council for International Education. However, any opinions and mistakes that appear herein are solely the author's.

among others. For instance, Safran asserts that ‘a nation of purely “political” essence is a fantasy... for in order for the “political” to do its work, there must be an identitive readiness that is based on psychological and cultural foundations’ (1999:91). He goes on to pick out linguistic markers as the most salient form of such foundations in individual interactions. These individual interactions are the specific object of ethnographic studies such as Miller (1999), which develops a model of enacted identity comprised of context, language use, and group membership. Through ethnographic data about a group of non-English-speaking, immigrant schoolchildren in Australia, Miller argues that ‘the important link between second language use and social identity must be seen in its relation to empowerment, being heard, and the ongoing process of self-realisation’ (1999:163). In a multilingual society, the status of the individual depends crucially upon that individual’s access to and proficiency in the language(s) of highest status within the national context. In Moldova, the notions of national context and the status of competing languages have been subjected to instability by recent and more distant historical events. The roots of ancient Moldovanism are still productive today because of two historical phenomena. The first involves Russian claims to the territory. Originally annexed by imperial Russia in 1812, the Moldovan territory east of the Prut River remained isolated during the entire process of Romanian nation-building that affected western Romanian-speaking territories (King 1999:49). Because of this, it did not participate in the consolidation and Latinization of the standard Romanian language. The second involves the impoverished, rural character of the Moldovans. During the Tsarist occupation, new urban and industrial areas were intentionally populated with russophone and germanophone minorities. As a result, the few Romanian speakers with access to education and political power were forced to adopt Russian, while the majority remained powerless peasants. These peasants maintained the ancient Moldovan identity, due to their forced exclusion from both Romanian and Russian identities.

Before and during the Soviet period, the peasant’s notion of ancient Moldovanism was exploited by the irredentist policies of Moscow toward the region, which had been unified with Romania after World War I. The propagation of a separate Moldovan language, using the Cyrillic script, was a central policy through much of this period. Despite this policy, however, the so-called Moldovan language never gained full functionality, because urbanized speakers of the so-called language were still encouraged to shift to Russian. As such, the notion of ancient Moldovanism was revived in modern, Soviet clothing.

Post-Soviet Identities

Due to this colonial heritage, the national identities of Moldovans at independence in 1991 took many forms: staunchly Romanian, staunchly Russian, and several notions of moderate Moldovan identity. This section of the study contains data from a survey of 124 students and young professionals in the capital, Chişinău. The data presented here relate primarily to social identity and its relation to language use. I will begin with a brief overview of the recent ethno-linguistic context.

Table I.
1989 Soviet census data on nationality groups in Moldova and their L1s and L2s (%)

Nationality	Population	%	L1 Self	L1 Moldovan	L1 Russian	L2 Moldovan	L2 Russian
Moldovans	2,794,749	64.5	95.4	(95.4)	3.3	1.7	53.1
Ukrainians	600,366	13.8	61.6	1.6	36.7	12.8	43.0
Russians	562,069	13.0	99.1	0.6	(99.1)	11.7	0.6
Gagauz	153,458	3.5	91.2	1.1	7.4	4.4	72.8
Bulgarians	88,419	2.0	78.7	2.4	18.1	6.9	68.3
Jews	65,672	1.5	25.9	0.8	72.9	15.2	23.1
Roma	11,571	0.3	82.0	13.5	3.6	30.6	41.9
Other	56,579	1.4	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	4,335,360	100	88.9	62.0	23.2	3.9	44.6

The Soviet census of 1989 provides the most recent demographic statistics for the country, some of which are presented in Table I (compiled from Karasik 1992, Gordon 1993 and King 1999). The census collected self-reported data on nationality and linguistic fluency. The notion of nationality in the Soviet Union was explicit and official, appearing in each citizen's identity card and passport. In addition, following official policy, Romanian and Moldovan were included as two different national identities. As such, there were only about two thousand Romanians counted in Moldova in 1989. Any local Romanians were counted as Moldovan. Similarly, many of the smaller minorities such as urbanized Ukrainians and Jews were likely counted as Russians, this being a more prestigious category to belong to, particularly for fully assimilated urbanites and those from multiethnic families. Because of these and other limitations, census data are often incomplete or inaccurate in unpredictable ways. These limitations of the data notwithstanding, the trends represented here remain relevant as a foundation for understanding the complexity of the country's ethno-linguistic identity dynamics.

As can be seen in Table I, self-identifying Moldovans made up almost two-thirds of the population in 1989, with Ukrainians and Russians competing for a distant second. Although the number of Jews has decreased significantly since independence, due to emigration, other groups have been fairly stable. There has also been a fair amount of economically motivated and often illegal emigration to the West, but this has likely affected all groups relatively equally. The statistics about language identification and second language (L2) proficiency have probably been less stable. The column marked 'L1 Self' gives the percentage of citizens who claimed a first

language (L1) with the same name as their nationality. For instance, the 'L1 Self' for Bulgarian nationals would be Bulgarian, while for Jews it would be Yiddish, etc. In 1989, almost all Moldovan nationals (95.4%) identified their L1 as Moldovan, with only a few (3.3%) who had shifted to Russian. However, more than half of Moldovans did claim fluency in L2 Russian. Russian nationals, on the other hand, very rarely shifted to Moldovan (0.6%) and also rarely spoke L2 Moldovan fluently (11.7%). Similarly, the other national minorities, aside from the Roma, tended to shift to or adopt L2 Russian rather than Romanian. For instance, among the Gagauz, only 5.5% had some fluency in Moldovan while 80.2% had developed fluency in Russian, either as L1 (7.4%) or L2 (72.8%).

The preference to learn Russian among minorities reflected the symbolic and institutional status of Russian during the Soviet period. The urban-rural split was also significant, with Russian spoken in the cities and national languages spoken in rural areas. For instance, although 3.3% and 53.1% of all Moldovan nationals had shifted to L1 Russian and acquired it as an L2, respectively, the percentages of assimilated Moldovans in the capital city were much higher, with 11% shifted and 74% fluent as an L2. Moreover, Gordon (1993:135) shows that the linguistic russification of Moldovan nationals increased dramatically in the two decades before independence, with a 13.6% increase in Russian fluency between 1970 and 1979 followed by a more moderate 7.2% increase between 1979 and 1989. This trend has abated significantly since independence, because Romanian now enjoys a status almost equal to Russian in many areas, particularly institutional. In contrast, the ethnic Russian adoption of the Romanian language remains low, although it has certainly increased somewhat. As a result of the linguistic russification of both Moldovan and other non-Russian nationals in the country, Russian had by 1989 become somewhat more widely spoken than Moldovan (Romanian). Looking at the totals in Table I, one can see that Moldovan was spoken by 65.9% of the population as either an L1 (62%) or an L2 (3.9%), while Russian was spoken by 67.8% (with 23.2% L1 and 44.6% L2). In addition, Russian was still much more highly valued, based on its prestige as an international, cultured language. As mentioned, it was also the language of the urban elites.

However, after 1989 the national and linguistic identities in the country began to shift radically. Perestroika led to the revival of the Romanian identity and demands by both Romanian and Moldovan identity groups for more power in the political, economic, and cultural markets of the country. The language laws of August 31, 1989, recognized the identical linguistic character of Romanian and Moldovan, returned official use of the language in the country to the Latin alphabet, and made it the sole official language. The apparent radicalism of this pro-Romanian movement led to an even more radical, violent reaction from the Russian-speaking minorities in the eastern region of Transnistria and the southern area of Gagauzia after the independence of 1991. Democratization of politics starting in 1994 led to moderation of the pro-Romanian ideology among leaders in Chişinău, but the break-away status of Transnistria, where the Russian army remains in a nominally peace-keeping role, has remained unresolved. In 2003, Moldova is ruled by a democratically-elected, revived Communist party that propagates the old Soviet policies of russification and Moldovan distinctiveness. But, more than a decade of non-Communist rule have established the pro-Romanian opposition as a permanent alternative in politics and identity choices. Although many still argue that Russian should be a second official language (because 'everyone' speaks it, as the ideology maintains), 'Moldovan' is still the only official language in the country's Constitution. At the same time, most educated, urban Moldovans will acknowledge that Romanian and Moldovan are the same language, even if they still refer to it from time to time as Moldovan. As I will show in greater detail below, the

national identity of Moldovans as separate from Romanians or Russians has been largely accepted, but cultural, particularly linguistic, identities have been much more contentious. Article 13 of the 1994 Constitution concerns the national language and the use of other languages in the country. The official translation into English reads:

- (1) The national language of the Republic of Moldova is Moldovan, and its writing is based on the Latin alphabet.
- (2) The Moldovan State acknowledges and protects the right to preserve, develop and use the Russian language and other languages spoken within the national territory of the country.
- (3) The State will encourage and promote studies of foreign languages enjoying widespread international usage.
- (4) The use of languages in the territory of the Republic of Moldova will be established by organic law.

Noteworthy here is that the term ‘Moldovan’ is used to the exclusion of ‘Romanian’ and that the Russian language is the only other language named explicitly. This draws out both the dominant roles of these two languages in the country and the contentiousness over which label to use for the national language. In order to clarify these issues, I will consider how languages are distinguished and identified in a national context like Moldova.

A language can be identified based on three criteria: structural differences, distinctions in social or national group membership, and differences in the value associated with them. The Moldovan dialect of Romanian does have several structural features that mark it as potentially distinct from standard Romanian. Many common words with labial consonants in initial position in standard Romanian are pronounced with non-labial equivalents in the Moldovan dialect. As a result, rural Moldovans will say /gine/ for standard /bine/ (in English, ‘well’), /kiʃware/ for /pitʃware/ (‘legs’), and /njere/ for /mjere/ (‘honey’). In addition, unstressed vowels are more commonly centralized toward schwa than in the standard variety. The lexicon of Moldovan also varies somewhat from standard Romanian. For example, rural Moldovans often say *curec* instead of the standard *varză* (‘cabbage’). Some other examples are *pepeni* for *castraveți* (‘cucumbers’) and *nică* for *nimic* (‘nothing’). These words are all simple regional variants. However, there are a number of other lexical differences based on borrowings from Russian. These include the Moldovan use of *creślă* for standard Romanian *fotoliu* (‘armchair’), *butilcă* for *sticlă* (‘bottle’), and *cran* for *robinet* (‘faucet’). However, few of these variations were actually integrated into the standard Moldovan promoted by the Soviet authorities, because they were associated too closely with the powerless spoken varieties of the rural peasants. Therefore, the standard Moldovan promoted throughout the Soviet period was essentially identical to standard Romanian with the exception of the alphabet and the use of Russian, rather than French, borrowings for technical terminology. As such, the structural criterion for distinguishing the languages disappeared with the introduction of the Latin alphabet in 1989 and the opening of the border with Romania in 1990 (Dyer 1999).

It is worth noting that a last remnant of the Cyrillic alphabet remains in some written forms of Romanian in Moldova. This remnant concerns the choice between the graphemes <î> and <â>, which both represent the high, central, unrounded vowel [i], a sound common to Slavic but not to other Romance languages. In standard Romanian, both graphemes appear in a distribution that allows the Latin roots of the language to be apparent. For instance, <î> is used in words like *în*

('in'), where an <i> or <e> appears in French, Italian, and Spanish cognates. But, <â> is used in words like *pâine* ('bread'), where the <a> would appear in western Romance languages. In Moldova, on the other hand, many street signs and written forms of Romanian avoid the <â> altogether. A typical example is the spelling *pîine* on bread shops. The <î> more closely resembles the Russian grapheme for the same sound, <и>. This avoidance of <â> reflects an anti-Romanian and pro-Russian ideology, because it preserves an element of the Slavic appearance and eschews the Latinate.

The second criterion used to identify a language, the one involving social group distinctions, is clearly present for Moldovan and Romanian. However, language is an aspect of national identity that tends to need deeper roots than other aspects. Because of this, North Americans still refer to their language as English rather than as American or Canadian, even though their national identity is clearly American or Canadian. Similarly, Austrians call their language German and many Belgians call theirs French. Just as the Belgians have with regard to French, Moldovans may have developed a national identity separate from Romania in the two centuries of isolation, but their language goes back much further. For that reason, many Moldovans who call themselves Moldovan nationals will still call their language Romanian (Crowther 1996). However, for the same reason, the notion of ancient Moldovan that was preserved during the two century isolation continues to support a separate Moldovan linguistic identity, one which has been reinforced by Soviet propaganda. As a result, the social criterion produces two competing identities for the indigenous people of Moldova: ancient Moldovanism, valorized by Soviet ideology, or modern Romanianism.

Finally, the criterion of status, or value, also draws a clear distinction between Romanian and Moldovan. Standard Romanian is a language rich in literary and scientific traditions. Of course, it has not had this status as long as many other European languages and is not widely adopted as an L2, but it is certainly multi-functional and thriving. Moldovan, on the other hand, borrowed the Romanian classics for its literature and never achieved much use as a scientific and technical language, despite Soviet efforts and claims (Korletianu 1979:5). On the contrary, Moldovan remained fairly limited functionally (Bruchis 1988). I have discussed the patterns of shift to Russian, particularly in the urban areas during Soviet times. This shift was facilitated by the unequal status of Russian and Moldovan. Russian was promoted by the Soviets as the language of international communication and the language of the revolutionary vanguard. As a symbol of imperial power, Russian was widely adopted in the Soviet empire by minority groups like the Moldovans, whose own language was far less prestigious and valuable in economic and political markets. Because of this, languages like Moldovan, although promoted as national languages, lost significant ground, both functionally and in sheer numbers of speakers, to Russian.

In essence, Moldovan was always the basilect, i.e. the low-status, intimate language, in a diglossic relationship with dominant Russian. This low prestige is also apparent in the attitudes of those who identify with a standard Romanian linguistic identity toward the Moldovan dialect and Russian borrowings. In conclusion, the notion of a separate Moldovan language is sustainable only based on the criterion of social group distinctions, since low status is not a justification for language maintenance in a contemporary, democratic society.

A Survey of Identity and Language Use

In this study, I examine three self-identified L1 groups: Romanian, Moldovan, and Russian. The other linguistic minorities, such as Ukrainian, Gagauz, and Bulgarian, exist in much smaller numbers in Moldova and primarily in the rural areas. The L1 Romanian and Russian groups are distinguished by all three criteria related to language identification. They are structurally different, associated with distinct ethno-national social groups, and highly valued in their respective linguistic markets. The inclusion of Moldovan as a separate L1 is based on the association of many Moldovans with this linguistic identity, presumably based on social group distinctions. I will also consider these three languages as L2s. Although many Moldovans are bilingual, their bilingualism varies in degree. Most, when pressed, will associate more strongly with one national language than with another. For this reason, even when a bilingual learned both languages from childhood and is fairly balanced in competence, I will consider the language with strongest group associations the L1 and the other an L2.

Finally, I will be studying the role of L2 English in Moldova. The English language is widely seen as a source of economic and cultural development for the struggling peoples of eastern Europe. This belief has been criticized as imperialistic and deceptive, benefitting the interests of Western powers (Phillipson 1992, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1997:39-40). Even given this role, belief in the power and status of English is apparent in Moldova, driven by the perceived and, thereby, actual necessity of English competence for access to the meager economic opportunities in the small private sector (Ciscel 2002b). Many urban Moldovans are more motivated to learn L2 English than the local L2 of their neighbors. In other words, caught between the old empire of the East and the new empire of the West, Moldovans scramble to determine not only their own identity, but how outside identities will influence them in the process. Ironically, the East-West struggle in Moldova has been a stalemate, producing disruptively balanced numbers of Russian, Moldovan, and Romanian social and linguistic identities.

In a survey conducted in 2001, 124 respondents at four educational institutions and two private companies, all in the capital city, provided information about their language uses and attitudes. The ages of respondents ranged from 15 to 46 with a mean of 21.3. The lower-end skew apparent in these age figures is attributed to the fact that most respondents were university students. The sample is hardly representative of Moldovans as a whole, even though it does capture the character of the well-educated, professionally oriented urbanites. The data appear in Table II.

Table II.
Cross-tabulation of self-reported national identity and L1 in survey subjects

Nat ID \ L1	<i>Moldovan</i>	<i>Romanian</i>	<i>Russian</i>	TOTAL
<i>Moldovan</i>	29 (4mx)	39 (2mx)	14 (11mx)	82 (17mx)
<i>Romanian</i>		17		17
<i>Russian</i>	1 (1mx)	1 (1mx)	13 (7mx)	15 (9mx)
<i>Ukrainian</i>			7 (4mx)	7 (4mx)
<i>Gagauz</i>			1 (1mx)	1 (1mx)
<i>None</i>		1	1	2
TOTAL	30 (5mx)	58 (3mx)	36 (23mx)	124 (31mx)

About two-thirds of respondents chose a Moldovan national identity. The remainder are concentrated in groups of Romanians with L1 Romanian and Russians or other minorities with L1 Russian. But, exceptional outliers also appear. These include two self-described Russians, one with L1 Moldovan and the other with L1 Romanian. Similarly, they are both from mixed families, as indicated by the number in parentheses with ‘mx.’ However, the majority of mixed families, by almost three to one, produced L1 Russian speakers. Also, two respondents chose not to identify with any nationality at all.

As seen above, self-reported national identity categories do not necessarily reflect the complexity of multiple social identity categories available to the individual (for further discussion see Safran 1999, McNamara 1997). For this reason, I developed an algorithm to determine an identity score based on responses to several items on the survey questionnaire, including self-reported location, kinship, and attitude factors. Each factor was placed on a scale from -2 (very Russian) to 2 (very Romanian) and then integrated into the composite identity score as follows: 30% location of birth and childhood, 20% linguistic kinship (L1s of parents), 40% political attitude related to a series of issues in Moldova, and 10% by the language the questionnaire was filled out in. Further details of this calculation can be found in Ciscel (2002a).

The overall social identity score for each respondent fell in the range between -2 and 2. In order to establish categories, this range is divided into four equal parts: scores 1 to 2 are extremely pro-Romanian (XRO), scores 0 to 1 are moderately pro-Romanian (MRO), scores -1 to 0 are moderately pro-Russian (MRU), and scores -2 to -1 extremely pro-Russian (XRU). This approach neatly separates the more extreme identity stances from the centralized, multi-cultural population in the Moldovan context. It further separates the middle into Slavic and Latinate oriented branches. The counts of social identity score and L1 appear in Table III.

Although artificial and, to a certain extent, arbitrary, the identity scores and categories both

reflect the complexity of the phenomenon and more convincingly represent the range of political ideologies available in the national context. The extremely pro-Romanian group (>1 XRO) primarily contains L1 Romanian speakers. Furthermore, all members are from unmixed families and tend to hold more extreme political views. The moderately pro-Romanian group ($0 > 1$ MRO) contains a balance of L1 Moldovan and Romanian, including many of those from mixed families in these L1 groups. The moderately pro-Russian group ($-1 < 0$ MRU) is more problematic. It is made up of 23 L1 Russian speakers, many from mixed families, and seven L1 Moldovan speakers. To reflect the L1 difference, this group is further divided into two groups for analysis in this study. The seven L1 Moldovan speakers are categorized as assimilated, or russified, Romanians (ARO), while the 23 L1 Russian speakers remain in the MRU category. Finally, the thirteen respondents who fall into the extremely pro-Russian group (< -1 XRU) are less likely to come from a mixed family and tend to hold more extreme political views. A separate group of L1 Russian speakers with an identity score greater than zero does not occur in the data. In sum, I have proposed five categories of social identity (the four in Table III, plus the extra ARO group discussed above) that both reflect the backgrounds and attitudes of the respondents and divide them into salient identity groups. The categories, from most pro-Romanian to most pro-Russian, are (1) XRO, (2) MRO, (3) ARO, (4) MRU, and (5) XRU. The categories also subsume L1 identities, since a chi-square of the data in Table III indicates significant correlation between identity and L1 groups (176.193, $df=12$, $p=0.000$).

Table III.
Cross-tabulation of identity ranges and L1

ID \ L1	<i>Romanian</i>	<i>Moldovan</i>	<i>Russian</i>	<i>Ukrainian</i>	TOTAL
>1 XRO	34	1			35
$0 < 1$ MRO	24 (3mx)	22 (3mx)			46 (6mx)
$-1 < 0$ MRU		7 (2mx)	23 (19mx)		30 (21mx)
< -1 XRU			12 (4mx)	1	13 (4mx)
TOTAL	58 (3mx)	30 (5mx)	35 (23mx)	1	124 (31mx)

This categorization has both weaknesses and strengths. The greatest weakness is that the categories are artificial, in that they do not reflect any one particular membership choice actually made by the respondents. Insofar as measurement of such an actual choice is even possible, however, the artificial score is composed of several different scores that do reflect the respondents' actual positions, at least as reported in the context of the survey. By balancing several related measures of attitude and identity, the score, although artificial, is able to triangulate and estimate a closer approximation of an actual, holistic identity than a single item, such as nationality. Therefore, the weakness of artificiality can also be interpreted as a strength in that the score is a composite.

Even so, the particular weighting of the aspects and the division of final scores into categories

can be criticized as arbitrary. Certainly, these processes were arbitrary. However, the resulting categories appear to represent well the salient categories of group membership on the ground in Moldova. For example, as discussed, extremist views at each end of the Romanian-Russian identity spectrum tend to be occupied by small, powerful groups of relative elites. This dynamic is captured in the scores. Also, the L1 and mixed family groups are neatly divided along a continuum by the scoring algorithm. Finally, the projection of identity categories along this continuum captures the individual variation and apparent ease of shifting among groups by adjusting a score up or down a few points in one direction or the other. In sum, although imperfect and likely, at times, inaccurate for particular individuals, the composite identity scores and categories proposed here are more powerful variables than national or linguistic identity alone. As such, their use in the study is justified.

The pattern of language use reported across the 124 subjects in the survey appears in Figure 1. The data presented here involve a composite score based on responses to a series of questions about frequency of language use in various social contexts and with different interlocutors. The points on the graph represent the degree of use of one language compared to another across the established social identity groups. For instance, the XRO group uses its L1 Romanian just more than 50% (1 degree) more often than L2 Russian. The same group uses L2 Russian and English equally often (0). Also, the XRU group uses L2 Romanian less often than English (-0.25 degree). The differences among identity groups for both L1 to local L2 and local L2 to English are highly significant ($p=0.000$ for each, based on one-way ANOVAs).




Figure 1: Differences in frequency of use of L1 to local L2 and local L2 to English by identity category

The general patterns reveal that members of the extremist XRO and XRU categories use their respective L1s much more often than the local L2, as would seem logical. In addition, they tend to use the local L2 and English equally often, despite the non-local status of English. Notably, the XRU members are more extreme than those in XRO, whose use is actually very similar to that of the MRU category on the L1 Russian side. The members of the MRO category use their L2 Russian fairly often, although not as often as their L1 Romanian. Correspondingly, they use L2 Russian much more often than English. This tendency is even more extreme in the members of the small ARO category, where Romanian and Russian use are almost balanced and English is used much less often than L2 Russian.

During the fieldwork, I had greater access to three groups of students at the State University of Moldova than to other subjects, because I had volunteered to teach an essay writing class once a week to each group during the Fall Semester of 2001. Because this was an optional class without a grade, attendance was low and sporadic. However, a few students in each of the three groups attended regularly, allowing me to get to know them well. Six of them also volunteered to do an individual interview and to fill out an additional questionnaire about their language proficiency. The stories of these six students of English translation flesh out the skeletal statistics of the broader survey. One of these ethnography subjects will be presented here in detail in order to illustrate the complexity of individual experience suggested by the above quantified data.

Lidia (a pseudonym) was categorized as belonging to the MRO group in this study. Her identity score was 0.467, based primarily on her claims to Moldovan rather than Romanian national and linguistic identity. She was raised in the capital city of Moldova, but with parents who she reports to be L1 Moldovan speakers. Her access to and acquisition of L2 Russian were earlier and more complete than for many of the XRO subjects. In the second year of school, at age 8, she began formal lessons in Russian, which continued throughout the remaining ten years in school, averaging three hours per week. She also reported using some Russian from an early age with neighbors and speaking it often with schoolmates after the age of 8. Even so, she reported using Russian regularly with only about ten percent of friends and family, primarily with neighbors and a few distant relatives. Lidia's use of L2 Russian in the contexts reported on the first questionnaire is more frequent than that of the other L1 Romanian subjects in the ethnography. In addition, her Russian was reported and tested at the highest proficiency of any L2 among the six subjects.

Lidia reported great ease with her L2 Russian in a range of functions and tested without errors on a written cloze test in that language. In contrast, her L2 English was similar to that of the other L1 Romanian subjects, quite proficient but not like her L1. Unlike her colleagues, Lidia began learning English only at the university, at age 17. Like the others, she had had almost five years of formal instruction in the L2, several hours per week. Her reported grades (around 9 out of 10) were as good as any student who had studied English in school. She has apparently been quite immersed in the language since entering the university. She reported beginning to use the language informally with other students in the third year, when she was 19. As a result, her score on the cloze test was also quite good for L2 English: 2.7/3.0. Having learned L2 Russian early and grown up essentially bilingual, Lidia seems to take to learning L2s naturally. During the interview, she said that learning Russian had indeed come 'naturally,' because all around her, in the street and even sometimes at home, people spoke it. She emphasized that learning Russian 'had never been a problem.' But, she also claimed that English had been easier than Russian. Like her classmates, she said that the grammar of English was much easier and that she wished

she had more opportunities to speak it, to gain fluency. In other words, she saw lack of access as the primary obstacle to her acquisition of English.

Despite her proficiency in both L2s, Lidia made consistent statements that reinforced her strong connection to L1 Moldovan (Romanian). She claimed to dream primarily in Moldovan and rejected outright any possibility of Russian as a second official language in Moldova. Although she thinks learning Russian is a good idea for Moldovans, she does not think that it should be mandatory. When asked about the recent attempts by the Communists to make Russian official, she predicted correctly that the Romanian nationalists and the people in general would not tolerate it. Indeed, for several months following the interview, the pro-Romanian Christian Democratic party held daily protests against russification in the streets and in the courts, ultimately winning in the latter. For Lidia, this was inevitable. But unlike many nationalists, she remained positive about L1 Russian speakers in Moldova and about the need for Russian to maintain a *de facto* leading role, even in the absence of *de jure* official status.

Given her proficiency in and frequent use of L2 Russian, Lidia's rejection of official status for the language seemed peculiar. Once during class, the topic of official Russian came up². The one L1 Russian speaker in the group argued that Russian needed to be made official, drawing an unfortunate comparison to the role of French in France's former colonies in Africa. More surprising than her willingness to make such a statement in front of a group of L1 Romanian colleagues was the simple acceptance of the idea of official status for Russian among these colleagues. With only one exception, everyone present that day, including an XRO group member, agreed that giving Russian official status would be acceptable or at least possible. Lidia was the only one of the half dozen L1 Romanian speakers who rejected the idea outright, in front of everyone. The various contradictions and hypocrisies wrapped up in this situation can only be explained by idiosyncratic aspects of social and linguistic identity. It is perhaps because of the precarious status of her L1, which she identifies as Moldovan rather than Romanian, that she was so willing to defend her position. Similarly, her XRO colleague, with the weight of Romania and its history behind her L1, likely did not feel that it was as necessary to defend the status of her L1 so virulently. Whatever the motives, it is clear from this episode that individuals often behave in unpredictable ways with regard to identity. From a set of unpredictable practices, one can, at times, identify patterns that reflect the spirit of a group, community, or nation.

Upon reflection, I should not have been shocked by the way the above scene played out. What was shaken by the discourse was more my own sense of idealism and justice than my impressions about how people interact concerning linguistic identity issues in Moldova. In fact, the scene reinforced many stereotypes that I have drawn from daily life there and tried, as a researcher, to resist. L1 Russian speakers often state their opinions directly, with the arrogance of one bestowed with privilege and advantage. In a group, L1 Romanian speakers generally do not resist. Those who do resist are sometimes marked, ironically, as arrogant or extremist by L1 Russian speakers. These are the mechanics of domination. I can imagine them working quite well in Soviet times. However, the illustration above is only an artifact of those times, an artifact that continues to surface at times, but one which is also often counterbalanced by L1 Romanian nationalists, who are often more assertive than the one present in this interaction, and, at times, even by moderate Moldovans like Lidia, who stand on the threshold of language shift to Russian but refuse to enter.

² This conversation was, unfortunately, not recorded. Therefore, the details of the interchange are based purely on my recollection and notes taken at the end of the lesson.

Conclusions

In this paper, I have proposed a set of social identity categories to be used in the analysis of the Moldovan context. Although the use of fixed, rigid identity categories contradicts the potentially fluid and volatile nature of social identities, the five categories described here are intended as approximations that will allow some control of the analysis of identity and language use phenomena. Despite the fact that individual subjects are discussed as members of particular categories, based on their identity scores, the multiple and complex character of these identities and the freedom of individuals to deviate at times from the program of their category are also assumed. These dynamic elements are captured by the representation of the range of identities as a continuum and by the focus on the complex social and linguistic practices of individual subjects. In sum, the categories established here are a convenience that facilitates analysis. The results from these analyses should be understood as occurring within the context of variability and individual differences that become evident with parallel, qualitative analyses. As such, the categories are proposed as soft guideposts to the stories of language and identity practices that are suggested by the brief introduction to Lidia.

Overall, the results show a pattern of language use that is deeply rooted in historical developments and recent social changes. The identities represent present instantiations of that history and those changes. As such, the patterns of reported language use illustrate the stalemate in struggles for national and cultural identity today in the Republic of Moldova. The prognosis for resolution of these issues is unclear, depending on both internal and external politics and, perhaps more than anything else, on the economic and social dynamics in the everyday lives of individual Moldovans like Lidia. The relative stability and moderation of the past decade provides some hope for an eventual resolution of the crisis in linguistic identity. However, persistent poverty and political extremism remain dangerous barriers to resolution of the crisis. The ultimate outcomes are relevant not only to Moldovans but to members of emergent national communities all over Europe and the world that are grappling with multilingualism and histories of colonization, for example the Scottish in Britain, the Corsicans in France (Jaffe 1999), the Catalan speakers of Spain (Woolard 1989), and countless others. For members of these communities, like for the Moldovans, language and social identity are inextricably linked in the experiences and challenges of national self-determination and individual self-realization.

References

- Bruchis, Michael 1988. *The USSR: Language and Realities*. Boulder, Colorado: East European Monographs
- Ciscel, Matthew 2002a. *Language and Identity: L2 acquisition in post-Soviet Moldova*. University of South Carolina dissertation
- Ciscel, Matthew 2002b. English in Moldova: A portrait of linguistic opportunism. *World Englishes* 21:403-419
- Crowther, William 1996. Nationalism and political transformation in Moldova. *Studies in Moldovan*, ed. by D. Dyer, 31-52. Boulder: East European Monographs
- Dyer, Donald 1999. *The Romanian Dialect of Moldova*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellon
- Fishman, Joshua 1973. *Language and Nationalism: Two integrative essays*. Rowley: Newbury House
- Gordon, Ellen 1993. *Legislating Identity: Language, citizenship, and education in Lithuania*. University of Michigan dissertation
- Jaffe, Alexandra 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Karasik, Theodore, ed. 1992. *USSR Facts and Figures Annual*, Volume 17. New York: Academic International Press
- King, Charles 1999. *The Moldovans: Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press

- Korletianu, N.G. 1979. V.I. Lenin i razvitie natsionalnykh iazykov [Lenin and the development of national languages]. *Voprosy Iazykoznanii* 28:3-10
- Laitin, David 1998. *Identity in Formation: The Russian-speaking populations in the near abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- McNamara, Tim 1997. What do we mean by social identity? Competing frameworks, competing discourses. *TESOL Quarterly* 31:561-7
- Miller, Jennifer 1999. Becoming audible: Social identity and second language use. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 20:149-65
- Phillipson, Robert 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Phillipson, Robert, and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1997. Linguistic human rights and English in Europe. *World Englishes* 16:27-43
- Safran, William 1999. Identity. *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, ed. by J. Fishman, 77-93. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sonntag, Selma 1995. Elite competition and official language movements. *Power and Inequality in Language Education*, ed. by James Tollefson, 91-111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Woolard, Kathryn 1989. *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Anne Fabricius: Mobility, contact and an accent norm: the case of Received Pronunciation
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
120-134
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Anne Fabricius and the Editors, 2005

Mobility, contact and an accent norm: the case of Received Pronunciation

Anne Fabricius

*Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
fabri@ruc.dk*

Abstract

This paper will focus on various facets of RP as an accent norm. In the first part of the paper I will set the stage for a renewed sociolinguistic view of RP, and examine some of the effects of social and geographical mobility and contact on RP. At the same time, one of my concerns will be to bring a renewed class analysis into the sociolinguistic discussion. I do this, contra many sociolinguists who have recently taken up the meta-narratives of, for example, the risk society, globalisation and late modernity (see e.g. Coupland, Sarangi and Candlin 2001), in order to argue for the continuing relevance of a restructured and updated notion of individually-instantiated social class for the discussion of an elite social class accent in Britain. Along the way, and perhaps controversially, part of the agenda of this paper will be to advance the case that a renewed understanding of the concept RP itself enables RP to claim a tenable place within descriptive sociolinguistics.

In the second part of this paper we will be looking at various facets of the changing situation of RP in present-day England. This includes data showing ongoing phonetic changes in progress, as well as overt and covert attitudes to RP. The phonetic data have been gleaned from sociolinguistic interviews, while the attitudinal data derive from interviews, subjective evaluation questionnaires and the popular press. By thus exploring the current and changing status of RP in the wider sociolinguistic landscape of Britain, the discussion will also highlight several ways in which variationist and attitudinal sociolinguistic studies can mutually benefit each other.

Construct versus native RP

Why look at RP sociolinguistically? To linguistically trained speakers of British English, this is perhaps *the* necessary first question, since RP, largely for historical reasons, tends to be envisaged as a somewhat mythical object. The apocryphal story about Daniel Jones, the compiler of the English Pronouncing Dictionary, is that he was asked how many speakers of RP there were in his department of Phonetics at UCL, and he replied “two”, which left people to wonder who the other one was. By tradition, RP tended to be firmly placed in the domain of phonetics (as Ramsaran 1990: 180 also claims). In addition, it is easy to see by looking at the Labovian or quantitative sociolinguistic literature, that since its beginnings, it has concentrated on examining so-called vernacular accents found in the working, lower and middle middle classes of speech communities, in Britain as well as elsewhere. The assumption, never expressed but implicit, has been more or less

that RP speakers were unsuitable or uninteresting as objects of sociolinguistic study, or that RP was solely to be regarded as an idealised model not locatable in the real world (see further below).

But surely, even banally, like all other members of society, RP speakers are part of a speech community. By definition, they will probably not ever be the point of origin for changes from below, but that does not mean that they will never participate in linguistic change. We actually know very little about the progress of sociolinguistic changes in that part of the community. I suspect that various assumptions about RP speakers have also precluded them from sociolinguistic studies. These include notions that the search for the vernacular is most ‘genuinely’ carried out in other parts of the community, that people of this kind are inaccessible, or that their generally high levels of education make them unreliable as naïve linguistic subjects. In one of the few studies against the general trend, Kroch’s work on the upper class of Philadelphia (Kroch 1995), the author experienced greater levels of cooperation from interviewees when they were told that the purpose of the study was speech rather than other, seemingly more risky, aspects of social life. This of course is in contrast to Labov’s practice (which has become general) of not revealing the true intentions of the investigator in a sociolinguistic study, for fear of contamination of the vernacular data which is so highly valued.¹

On another level, there is the possibility that sociolinguists’ reluctance to tackle RP stems partly from the fact that there is a systematic ambiguity in the term. When the term RP or Received Pronunciation, (which is what the abbreviation stands for) is used, it actually covers two things that I feel must be kept conceptually distinct. First, it refers to the vernacular of those individuals for whom RP is their native variety (by Trudgill’s (2002) estimate, around 3 percent of the British population), which I have elsewhere called ‘native RP’. Second, it refers to ‘construct-RP’ the more or less conscious and more or less consistent construct of pronunciation norms and accent attitudes that can be held in people’s heads, or presented in pronunciation dictionaries. It includes ideas about how words are ‘correctly’ pronounced, if that concept is at all relevant to an individual (and it won’t be so for all).² It also present in statements that linguists sometimes make about what is ‘permitted’ in RP. (Note that it makes no sense to talk about something being phonetically ‘permitted’ in a native accent, so the concept of permission must refer to prescriptive attitudes held by individuals). An added complication here is that for people both within the native RP group and for some people outside it, construct RP has had a role as a reference accent. It has also previously had an important institutional role as the accent which dominated on the BBC in the early days of broadcasting. By these definitions then, I envisage construct RP as a far more complicated thing than native RP, separate from it, but with links to it. Native RP is also simpler to access in that it is grounded in a social group, and, we might assume at this point (in the absence of sociolinguistic evidence to the contrary), the process of socially-embedded language change in native RP operates more or less as it does in the rest of the community.

But the way RP is referred to in sociolinguistic studies tends to blur this important distinction between native RP and construct RP, and this has dire consequences for a sociolinguistic understanding of the accent. The fact remains that native RP changes over generations, while

¹ See Milroy and Gordon (2003) for a critique of the theoretical construct of *the vernacular*.

² I would not deny that many people have experienced what Abercrombie (1965) called the “accent bar” first hand, and that antagonism and downright hostility are the natural reactions to what remains systematic accent prejudice. My point is also that this prejudice and its sociolinguistic ramifications are relevant to the sociolinguistic situation under investigation. It is part of the sociolinguistic life and history of the accent, however socially unjust it is.

construct RP seems to have a tendency to fall behind. One example of this lag can be seen in the interview I recorded in Cambridge in 1997 with a male speaker who had experience of singing in an internationally famous choir; he referred to the choirmaster's wish to keep *morn* and *mourn* distinct, i.e. retaining the /U/ with schwa offglide which has become obsolete in younger native RP. His comment on this is:

S: that's the thing, it is, singing in a choir is a very standardising thing and and in the case of X (college) it's standardising to some vague notion of RP of fifty years ago I think, which is no doubt what our world service listeners want to hear, who knows (M3).

In the specific context that the speaker refers to, RP norms, even outdated ones, still have resonance for at least some speakers. But if the phonetic norms of construct RP are no longer widely cited in the public domain or in the community, and a native RP voice is heard less and less often on radio and TV, the consequence of the conceptual blur between construct and native RP is that laypeople and linguists alike claim that "No-one speaks RP anymore" (see e.g. John Wells' discussion of this in Wells 1997).

We can see this line of thinking in operation in James Milroy's paper entitled "Received Pronunciation: who "receives" it and how long will it be "received"" (J. Milroy 2001). His stated purpose is "to consider the proposition that RP no longer exists" (2001:15). By contending that the linguistic (i.e. primarily the segmental-phonological) characteristics of RP (which we here call 'native RP') are not sufficient to define the accent, he chooses to make its continued 'existence' contingent upon the continuation of the accent's previous high status in the speech community (an aspect which, we have argued here, belongs to construct RP). Thus, he maintains, the idea that the accent is 'received' is central to the accent's definition; here we move definitively into the domain of construct RP. Milroy claims that even though the phonetic forms of RP can still be heard, the social conditions which brought about the accent are no longer the same and that it "is no longer uniquely "received" in the way it used to be" (J. Milroy 2001:31).³ If both claims are true, then the accent both still exists (in a phonetic and phonological sense) and does not still exist (in a social sense). We are left with an RP that is, as Churchill said of Russia in October 1939, "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma".⁴ The only way out of this paradox, which, as I see it, arises from an analytical choice, has to be that we stringently separate out two senses of the term 'RP', the two senses, which, I have argued previously, make the single term systematically ambiguous (see also Fabricius 2000:29, 2002)

My argument in this paper, then, is that alongside generation-based changes affecting speakers of native RP (and, as Milroy points out, many of the phonological changes in recent times have been due to external influences⁵), social and economic history have had an important influence on the sociolinguistic status of construct RP. As Milroy writes, (construct) RP was always in an unusual

³ This point is not intended to dispute Milroy's excellent analysis of the historical sociolinguistic circumstances (including high levels of middle-class social mobility in the late 1800s), which brought about the levelled variety Received Pronunciation at that time. See further below.

⁴ Macaulay (1988) echoes this when he writes: "Certainly linguists should be interested in every type of speech, including the exotic upper-class varieties, but the only way to see them in perspective is through a comprehensive study of the community", in other words, a sociolinguistic study. The label *exotic* I don't subscribe to, but I would suggest that Macaulay's ire against RP is actually against construct RP, and native RP is hauled along in its wake. Macaulay's reference to RP as an 'idealization' indicates that he is thinking of construct RP without having made a distinction between it and native RP.

⁵ It is not relevant here to discuss Milroy's arguments about internal and external change to a language variety.

position as a standard accent, since it did not ever have general acceptance by the population, one feature that standard accents are generally expected to have (2001:16). In the social conditions under which it came about, in the late 1800s, it was the result of the cloistering of generations of boys (and to some extent, girls) in boarding school establishments, where accent levelling operated alongside a conscious teaching of pronunciation norms, so that the accent which emerged could be seen as a badge of educatedness, functioning as a ‘gatekeeping accent’, admitting those who were qualified for the many new Civil service and military positions that the British Empire demanded (Milroy 2001:20-21). Milroy argues convincingly that RP (of both kinds) originated in an era of “a high degree of upward social mobility” in the nineteenth century, as a result of the expansion of the public school sector and its opening to members of the newly-prosperous middle classes of the time (also documented in Mugglestone 2003).

Milroy’s claims about the present status of construct RP are also highly relevant here. Milroy (2001:25) notes that exclusive attitudes to accent do remain in Britain, but have retreated in the face of the empirically verifiable fact that RP is no longer the only ‘accent of the educated’ or ‘literate’, following expanding access to university education since the 1960s. Its specially-marked status as the marker of educatedness is thus in terminal decline, and changing media practices in admitting other accents to the domains which were once denied to them (news reading on the BBC, for example) reflect that fact. At the same time, a ‘levelled Southern British English’ variety, now generally known as Estuary English, is advancing to the point of becoming a mainstream accent, becoming more and more commonly heard in the media.

The evidence thus points to the erosion of ‘construct’ RP’s status as a “standard” accent; as an accent it is no longer aspired to, or used as a reference point to the same extent as previously. However, I would contest that native RP is still an elite accent, in the sense that it belongs to a group who are undoubtedly an economic and social elite, albeit not the only such elite group in Britain. I would also contest that ‘construct’ RP still has resonance in some parts of the British speech community, albeit not for a large group or a majority group, by any means. In the following sections, I will suggest elite accents persist as a result of elite social distinctions based on education. Furthermore, the claim is made that the much-touted classless society is to some extent ideological rather than socially real. Classlessness is not all that the term implies.

Social class theory and sociolinguistics

Adonis and Pollard (1997) is one example of a polemic over the “myth of classlessness” in British society. Their claim is that while the bases of determining social class may have changed, this cannot be the same as the claim that classes have disappeared. Inequalities in access to education, as can be seen in the case of the independent sector, to jobs, and to living standards still exist. In their introductory chapter Adonis and Pollard summarise present-day Britain thus (1997: 10):

Cultural distinctions and nuances remain legion. Accents, houses, cars, schools, sports, food, fashion, drink, smoking, supermarkets, soap operas, holiday destinations, even training shoes: virtually everything in life is graded with subtle or unsubtle class tags attached...And underpinning these distinctions are fundamental differences in upbringing, education and occupations.

The idea that Britain is becoming a classless society is, according to Adonis and Pollard (1997: 14-15):

a clever ruse to discredit the notion of class divisions without actually denying their existence... The classless society is therefore not a society without classes, but ... a meritocratic society providing means for people to advance by ability regardless of class origins.

Adonis and Pollard claim that the goal of a meritocratic or classless society, touted especially by Conservative politicians in the 1990s, effectively glosses over the fact that economically-determined segregation into different forms of education still exists, and is a powerful factor determining the ability of talented pupils to achieve. Class differences, they argue, persist most prominently in education, and it is this aspect of their analysis of present-day Britain I wish to focus on here. "Education", they write "is the engine of social mobility, and Britain's, particularly England's, education system does not remotely provide equality of opportunity" (Adonis and Pollard 1997: 36). Educational segregation in Britain begins with the earliest levels of schooling; increasingly, it begins at nursery level, as independent schools open crèches (from age 1½) which act as feeders for their infant schools. The infant schools feed into the independent primary schools from age five, preparatory schools from age 8, and public schools from age 13. Such is the flow through the system that, for example, Eton College's website includes a list of the preparatory schools which have previously sent boys to Eton. The website further encourages parents with boys on the waiting list to keep the school up to date if a prospective student changes preparatory (prep) school (state primary schools don't get a mention at all). Economic advantage is the deciding factor for access to independent education at all stages, scholarships notwithstanding, as Adonis and Pollard emphasise again and again. Finally, at the point of selection for higher education, years of advantage and specialised tutoring have placed independent school pupils well in the race for good university places. The following figures give one example of the continuing disparities of access between the state and private education systems in Britain.

TABLE 1: Five year admissions trend to Cambridge for home/EU students (excluding Overseas and other) by school and college type⁶

Year of Entry	State School (%)	Independent School (%)
2003	1,643 (55)	1,360 (45)
2002	1,672 (56)	1,340 (44)
2001	1,458 (53)	1,336 (47)
2000	1,458 (52)	1,336 (48)
1999	1,461 (53)	1,320 (47)

These figures show Cambridge entrance rates over the past five years, a period when media attention has at different times focussed on equality of access to the collegiate universities, and, it has to be admitted, the universities themselves have set up schemes to try to even out the differences. While state school rates of admission to Cambridge in the most recent year have reached 55%, this only seems equitable until we compare this with the actual size of the two populations, and consider that only 7% of sixth forms in Britain are from the independent school sector. The collegiate university interview system is generally blamed for this (e.g. by Decca Aitkenhead⁷). The conclusion must be that the school system and Oxbridge education remain segregating forces in British society.

⁶ Source: <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/news/press/dpp/2004031201> (accessed 16th March 2004)

⁷ *Guardian* 24 May 1999.

If the idea of the classless society is but an ideological ruse to disguise the continued existence of social classes, then what is the status of the concept of social class in sociological theory? To provide a tentative answer here, I will refer to the work of Mike Savage, professor of sociology at the University of Manchester, who argues that the concept of social class still has relevance for sociological theorizing in his book *Class Analysis and Social Transformation* (Savage 2000). While this work criticizes earlier models of class analysis (most notably those of John Goldthorpe and his colleagues), as being technical and arcane, and inadequate for various reasons, he wants to reintegrate social class into sociological theory. Savage argues for an individuated mode of class analysis, a theoretical use of the concept of class which ties it to people's own negotiations around the term in their own lives, thus making class a conceptual link between various "mediated, complex, local and ambivalent social processes" (Savage 2000:149). Superior incomes and job positions are accomplished by individuals, as cumulative processes, and class is thus "instantiated in people's lives" (Savage 2000:150). His claim is further that economic and social inequalities persist in Britain, while class cultures have been transformed. The first transformation lies in the loss of the defining role of the working class in British culture. The working class has lost its "proud independence" as a class of people who mastered a trade. The conditions for the working class have changed so that 'working class' as a positive cultural concept has dissolved or decomposed, remaining only as a "cultural frame", "a ghostly presence at the heart of British culture" in that many people still express identification with "values of ordinariness and unpretentiousness" which are reflections of "anti-elitist and populist connotations that the term has historically possessed" (Savage 2000:155). The working class has instead in reality become the servile class. The second transformation is of the middle class, which has developed from its original 'servile' status, where it was dependent on employers, but promised continuing employment (ibid). For the middle class, the meaning of career and work have changed radically during the twentieth century. The concept of professionalism has become central and "new modes of individualization have come to focus on the self-developmental and transformative capacities of the self" (Savage 2000:156). Traditionally, individuality relied on class position, but now fixed boundaries are no longer enforced, and, Savage concludes, "the individual pursues a project of the self in each new situation" (ibid). The result of this is that those who win the class war come to blur the notion of class itself, or regard it as irrelevant. This of course concurs with the whole debate about the 'classless society', which Adonis and Pollard deconstruct. Social class can now be seen as ambivalent. It is both present in obvious and visible ways but pushed aside and ignored by a middle-class individualized culture. The importance of social class hierarchy (on a vertical dimension) as part of class culture has faded, which can be seen, for example, in the decline of forelock-tugging deference of the lower classes to the upper classes. It can, moreover, be seen directly in the decline of deference to the norms of construct RP, or to speakers of native RP.

But this does not entail native RP has ceased to exist. If we accept the evidence of network-based sociolinguistic analyses (e.g. L. Milroy 1980), then it seems clear that some distinctive features of speech can probably still be found in public-school circles, given their persistent social exclusiveness, at least during the period of school and university education. Comments by the interviewees in my Ph.D. study on 'sounding public school' also suggest this (Fabricius 2000:54). As generation has succeeded generation, however, this form of speech has not remained static, as we can see from the well-documented changes in RP in the course of this century (e.g. Wells 1997). I would suggest furthermore that the ideology of the 'classless accent' may be similar to the ideology of the 'classless society', a remaking of traditional class distinctions, this time in speech, so that expressions of individuality depend on a project of individualization which gives space to

other voices. As we have seen, social and economic privilege persist in Britain, and the most natural sociolinguistic expectation would be that linguistic differences reflecting privilege would remain. But the social elite accent now very commonly suggests not only privilege and exclusiveness, but also conservatism, arrogance and prejudice. This accent, in other words, conjures up connotations of the old order. Comments in the popular press suggesting that a ‘traditional’ RP accent can be a distinct disadvantage in some contexts can, I think, be seen as bringing out the new middle class modes of individualisation that Savage discusses, by rejecting an accent which has associations with older forms of individualization based on vertical social class distinctions. In conclusion then, we need a remade concept of social class to understand the decline of construct RP. If accent forms can undergo levelling (as RP has done with accents of the South-East), maybe accent norms can undergo levelling too. One example of this we have already seen, in the decline of the norm about *morn* versus *mourn*. *Whine* /hw/ versus *wine* /w/ has met a similar fate: what was formerly seen as a necessary distinction is now seen as overly fussy and pedantic.⁸

Geographical mobility and the breakdown of non-localisability

We turn now to the concept of non-localisability and its interaction with the increased geographical mobility which has characterised the latter part of the twentieth century. Non-localisability is often cited as a defining characteristic of Received Pronunciation: that RP, while it is a British accent, is non-localisable within Britain. Indeed, it is the one defining characteristic used to separate RP and Estuary English, according to Wells’ (1998) definition of EE, which reads: “standard English spoken with an accent that includes features localisable in the southeast of England.” In terms of sociolinguistic processes we can see why RP came to be non-localisable: it was formed and promulgated in the non-localisable boarding schools from the 1870s onwards. These schools gathered their intake of students from all over the country, and separated them from local networks and local modes of speaking, with predictable homogenising results.

However, as Milroy (2001) also points out, the social situation which brought about RP is no longer the same. While social mobility is at the centre of Milroy’s argument, geographical mobility has also been evident as a driving motor in widespread levelling of previously distinct regional dialects, a phenomenon which has been observed all over the country (Foulkes and Docherty 1999:13). We may ask, then, to what extent has geographical mobility challenged the ‘non-localisable accent’?

We will briefly diverge to look at a slightly different conceptualisation of (native) RP’s non-localisability. In a formulation which places fine-grained phonetic detail in a central position, Nolan (1999:86) explicitly rejects the strong version of non-localisability, characterised as the “common view which refuses to locate RP geographically, and ... views it as a non-regional prestige variety”. Nolan’s definition of RP is (quoted from Nolan and Kerswill 1990: 316): “Received Pronunciation (RP) is the long-established term for the prestige accent of South East England which also serves as a prestige norm in varying degrees elsewhere in Britain.”⁹

In this approach, which I find very useful, since it takes account of variation in a way which many discussions of RP do not, Nolan contends that (native) RP forms a phonetic and phonological continuum with local accents in the Southeast. He bases this for example on observable systematic variation in the GOAT vowel (disregarding its special allophone before /l/). The narrow first element

⁸ Fashion norms in other areas of life, it should be noted, do the same. The wearing of gloves and hats is one example.

⁹ As I have argued above, I would prefer to call native RP an elite, rather than a prestige, accent, in the sense that it belongs to an economic elite.

of the diphthong in RP (schwa) can be seen as one end of a phonetic continuum “in which increasingly open first elements correlate with decreasing socio-economic prestige (culminating in ‘Cockney’ [aU].” Nolan (ibid) argues that no such phonetic continuum can be found to link RP and northern varieties of English, where, for example in South Yorkshire, the low prestige vowel would be [U] with schwa offglide, and the more prestigious form for GOAT approaching cardinal vowel 9, similar to RP THOUGHT, “neither of which can be straightforwardly placed on a simple phonetic continuum with the RP form”.

Furthermore, Nolan claims that, geographically, because of the socio-economic affluence of the South East,

the majority of RP speakers are in contact with one set of regional varieties, namely those of the London area, and since RP forms a continuum with those varieties, it is not surprising that there should be some parallels between the historical development of RP and that of these other varieties (1999: 87).

In summary then, according to Nolan’s conceptualisation, RP and the accents of the south are undergoing similar changes which sweep across all varieties in the region, presumably because of increased geographical mobility. If RP participates in linguistic changes active in the Southeast (or perhaps the South in general in some cases), this may go so far that regionalised varieties of RP can be identified. To mark such a possibility Cruttenden (1994) introduced the term ‘Regional RP’ as a subvariety of RP, the London version of which he identifies with Estuary English in the sixth edition (2001).

There is some evidence that certain features of younger speakers’ native RP do have regional distributions. In my study of the speech of a group of ex-public school students born in the 1970s (Fabricius 2000), I examined rates of t-glottalling (the pronunciation of word-final /t/ as a glottal stop). Figure 1 shows the distributions of t-glottalling by speaker’s regional origin and phonetic context. The regional analysis is based on sorting the speakers into groups according to where they had lived for most of their lives.




Figure 1: Interview style: t-glottalling and region (reproduced from Fabricius 2000:98)

If we examine the means (the average value for a group) for each region, we can see that the pattern of variation for the pre-vocalic environment across the regions is slightly different from the pattern for the pre-pausal environment. The results in the pre-vocalic category show a stepwise pattern, decreasing from London through the Home Counties to the rest of England. This pattern does not apply to the pre-pausal environment, where the group average for glottal stop in the Home Counties group is very similar to the value for the London group. To sum up the statistical results (obtained using ANOVA), the London speakers' rates of pre-vocalic t-glottalling were significantly different from the other two regions combined ($F(1,64)=8.721$, $p=0.004$), while the rest of England group had statistically significant differences from London and the Home Counties together in rates of t-glottalling pre-pausally ($F(1,65)=9.98$, $p=0.002$) and pre-vocalically ($F(1,65)=6.492$, $p=0.013$) (for details, see Fabricius 2000:98-103) The relationships for the different phonetic environments across the different regions can be summarised in Figure 2, which uses separate columns to indicate statistically significant differences. Within the pre-vocalic environment, all groups are significantly different from each other, while in the pre-pausal environment the Home Counties pattern together with London, separate from the rest of England. No significant differences were found between the different regions in the pre-consonantal environments.

Consonant:	London + Home Counties + Rest		
Pause:	London + Home Counties		Rest
Vowel:	London	Home Counties	Rest

Figure 2 Interview Style: Region and Environment in word-final t-glottalling

In Fabricius 2000, I concluded that high rates of t-glottalling pre-consonantly (around 70% for stops, 80% for Liquids/Semivowels, around 60% for Fricatives) were a stable feature of Interview speech style of all speakers from all regions. If we take a diachronic view of this situation, and consider earlier reports of t-glottalling's distribution (e.g. Wells 1982: 261) to be accurate, it seems that word-final pre-consonantal t-glottalling has completed its spread and is now common for this generation of upper middle class speakers from further afield than the Southeast of England. Translated into historical terms: Pre-consonantal glottalling can be regarded as the 'first wave' of glottalling. The 'second wave' seems to be the pre-pausal category, which in the present analysis shows a significant difference between the Southeastern category and the 'rest of England' category. As we have seen, London and the Home Counties pattern together on this feature, while the Rest of England lags behind. The 'newest' wave of t-glottalling is evident in the pre-vocalic category, where the London-raised public school speakers use pre-vocalic t-glottalling at a significantly higher rate than speakers from other parts of England in less formal styles of speech. (but see also the discussion of this hypothesised spread of t-glottalling in Straw and Patrick 2002).

We can now return to the concept of non-localisability and discuss it in the light of these sociolinguistic results. Non-localisability, as we have shown through the quantitative sociolinguistic analysis presented here, can be tested empirically: by asking whether the speakers from the same social group but different regions show significantly different results. The regionalised results for t-glottalling in native RP suggest that RP is indeed regionalising at a micro level. In the interview speech analysed here, word-final pre-consonantal t-glottalling is a non-localisable feature. Word-final pre-pausal t-glottalling is approaching non-localisability, but has not moved significantly further than the Home Counties. Word-final pre-vocalic t-glottalling occurs in the speech of all speakers in the sample; but t-glottalling in this position at a significantly high rate (over 50%) is a localisable London feature.

Construct-RP at the micro-level

We move now from considering native RP at the micro-level to examining construct RP at the micro-level. In this section, I will illustrate some of the ways in which norms of speech are created, expressed, and negotiated. The first example consists of two spontaneous comments from an interview recorded in 1998, which give some instances of normative behaviour and a clash between generations as to notions of correctness or appropriateness:

I: um did your mother and father ever talk about um the way that you spoke as a child

R: yes... not so much me as the other two [younger siblings] cause the other two used to glottally stop all the time so they'd go 'wha'' [glottal stop] and my mother'd go 'what' [t'] like this

In this excerpt, the interviewee reports on and demonstrates her mother's correction of the glottalled pronunciation of 'what', presenting her mother as using the ejective [t'] (interestingly, not aspirated [t^h]) as the normative model. The mother is of course here following the societal condemnation of glottalled /t/ which has been much reported in the media in Britain (Foulkes and Docherty 1999: 11). However, the interviewee then reports on her own reactions to aspects of her mother's pronunciation, which she feels is overly 'posh' and too reminiscent of 1950s BBC pronunciation:

R: there's sort of a slight backlash going on at the moment my mother says 'yer' she says like he's twenty-three years [j3:z] old and it's like "No, mother, 'year'" [pronounced as in mainstream RP NEAR]

I: so you're correcting her

R: trying to sort of slightly bring this back down to not quite so much like 50's BBC television presenters (...)

Note that the interviewer's comment "so you're correcting her" isn't accepted by the speaker as a gloss of what the daughter is doing here. Rather, the process is characterised as "bringing this back down", from a place which is in some sense too 'high', and thus, I would venture, too 'posh', or too 'snobby'. This type of anecdotal evidence, elicited in interview situations where the focus is on language attitudes, can give valuable insights into changes in norms and normative behaviour.

A second type of anecdotal evidence which concerns the sociolinguistic place of RP is to be found on a more society-wide level. This consists of the kind of journalism on linguistic topics which appears regularly in the media. While such journalists' grasp of linguistics can vary widely, this does not mean that such articles should necessarily be dismissed out of hand by professional linguists. As texts they can be quite revealing of mainstream (and minority) attitudes to language, and thus useful as indicators of the flow of opinion. One example can be found in a feature article by India Knight in the *Sunday Times*, 11 November 2001, available online on the Estuary English page at <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/educres.htm>. Knight's essay was spurred by the Glaswegian Speaker of the House of Commons, Michael Martin's sacking of his secretary, Charlotte Every, 38, on the grounds that her accent 'got on his nerves'. Ms Every, as a speaker of RP, was characterised as speaking like a 'Sloane Ranger' (the 1980's term for what could be characterised as *advanced RP* in Gimson's terms).

On the basis of this, Knight claims that "political correctness has sprung to the rescue of every single kind of accent", except her own, that people will "laugh like drains at the absurdity of public

school voices”, while regional accents are defended, she claims, on the grounds that “it’s terribly important to maintain this kind of regional linguistic diversity”. This ‘inverted snobbery’, according to Knight, has led (advanced) RP speakers to adopt a habit of “drop[ping] the accent a notch or three” in certain circumstances, mainly because “speaking properly is more trouble than it’s worth”. She then lists a series of assumptions which are made when people hear an RP accent:

you are immediately viewed with hostile suspicion, the implication being you are probably some ghastly plummy nob, your very existence confirming the fact that there are still people who sneer down their long, well-bred noses at the plebs. You are also viewed with defensiveness ... and with mistrust...

These character traits, cleverness, snobbishness, lack of social skills and untrustworthiness, are immediately reminiscent of typical responses to RP accents in language attitude studies in the 1970s and 1980s. For India Knight, these reactions are “moronic in their predictability”, with the result that:

we Sloane-speakers have become a fraudulent, beleaguered minority, pretending to be something we are not every time we open our mouths... To the rest of the world, though, we are the proud(ish) possessors of the only accent in Britain that is still an albatross.

India Knight, however, is not the only RP speaker to feel put upon in this way. Boris Johnson, an Old Etonian, editor of the *Spectator*, and vice Chairman of the Conservative Party, claimed in 1999 that he had been sacked as a presenter on BBC Radio 4’s “The Week in Westminster” because of his accent, which he claimed the radio station deemed to be too ‘plummy’. BBC Radio 4 denied that accent had been the factor involved, but the author of the report of this on the BBC website¹⁰ nonetheless consulted Gregory de Polnay, head of voice at the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art, who offered suggestions as to how to make Boris Johnson’s voice more acceptable for radio. These suggestions are framed as a fact box on the side of the page headed “Top tips to become less ‘plummy’”. Although this ‘pseudo-phonetics’ is linguistic nonsense, it would not be possible as a piece of journalistic writing unless being ‘too plummy’ as a concept somehow struck a chord in the public consciousness. That this type of advice should at all be deemed necessary and newsworthy surely indicates a different attitudinal ‘place’ for such accents nowadays, far removed from the deference accorded to BBC pronunciation up until the 1960s (for discussion of the Boris Johnson case, see also Altendorf 2003:35.)

A third source of information on attitudes towards language varieties comes from the attitude studies which have been carried out in various ways within sociolinguistics since the 1960s, inspired by social psychology, and, more recently, perceptual dialectology (see Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2003). In 2002 I conducted one such study of ‘dialect in discourse’ in York, using six separate passages of spontaneous speech (three male speakers, three female speakers) as prompts for a group of teenage listeners in three secondary schools. The students were asked to make a range of attitudinal judgments and give qualitative (discourse) as well as quantitative (scale ratings) responses. Transcripts of the four passages are presented in appendix 1, with two RP speakers (H and T) and two regional speakers (E and N). H and E are female, T and N male. This paper will present just a small part of the results obtained. Figure 3 below shows a summary of the qualitative responses given by speakers from three schools in York to the prompt: *Please write down your first impressions of this person*. The data were transcribed in full and grouped into semantic fields, using a keywords approach (see also Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2003). The numbers given in the

¹⁰ See http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/uk/newsid_468000/468895.stm

chart below show the boys' versus the girls' responses to the four segments of discourse. Each semantic category is presented as a percentage of the total number of counted responses (items such as 'male' or 'young male' were not included in the coding).

Figure 3: qualitative responses by sex

	1 nervous	2 confident	3 boring	4 interesting	5 average	6 intelligent	7 posh	8 friendly	Total
H girls	1%	4%	8%	5%	0%	31%	18%	32%	99%
H boys	0%	5%	9%	8%	3%	31%	17%	26%	99%
E girls	2%	2%	5%	16%	8%	9%	2%	55%	99%
E boys	2%	3%	6%	17%	19%	14%	0%	38%	99%
T girls	3%	2%	14%	8%	7%	25%	21%	19%	99%
T boys	1%	4%	14%	8%	6%	31%	19%	16%	99%
N girls	2%	6%	5%	16%	3%	22%	6%	39%	99%
N boys	3%	1%	2%	11%	5%	25%	12%	42%	101%

nervous and not very confident

positive, confident and independent

boring and quiet

interesting, outgoing, chatty, bubbly, straightforward

average achiever, not very intelligent

intelligent, well-educated, well-spoken, ambitious

posh, snobby, spoilt

friendly, relaxed, trustworthy, pleasant

The first four response categories can be characterised as representing different aspects of the concept of 'dynamism', an over-arching category which covers the extent to which speakers are judged as 'dynamic', i.e., interesting, positive, confident, outgoing and independent. The last four (numbers 5 to 8) cover concepts which can be grouped under the label 'superiority', whether this has to do with competence (judgments of 'intelligent' or average achiever) or sociability (posh, friendly) (see Kristiansen 2001 for further elaboration).

The results presented in figure three summarise the categorisations spontaneously produced by the students in judging RP versus non-RP dialect in discourse. The most interesting comparisons come from comparing the voices on the vertical dimension in the table. The categories of 'nervous' and 'confident' do not appear particularly often in the qualitative responses, so it is hard to generalise on these particular traits. The most salient dimension of dynamism appears in the 'boring' versus 'interesting' dimension, where T (the male RP speaker) tops the group as the most boring speaker, a fact which is confirmed in his low placement in the 'interesting' category. The two regional speakers N and E receive twice as many judgments as 'interesting' than the two RP speakers, thereby emerging as more dynamic voices on this particular dimension. Categories five and six reflect judgments along the competence dimension, where E (regional female voice) is marked (especially by the boys) as the average achiever, and considered not particularly intelligent. This reflects comparisons between standard (RP) guises and non-standard guises in attitude studies from the 1970s. T and H are categorised as the voices of 'poshness', while judgments as 'friendly' occur at a high rate for E and N, and slightly lower for H, while T comes at the bottom. We can thus see a range of qualities attributed to the RP speakers, with the interesting result that the female speaker is more often given positive attributes than the male RP speaker. Perhaps this is because a male RP voice elicits stronger establishment associations than a female RP voice and the male voice is thus subject to stronger condemnation. These adolescent evaluations of dialect in discourse show a

continuing link between RP and certain attitudinal judgments, such that RP continues to have associations with poshness, high intelligence and lack of friendliness. As an indication of the 'place of RP' in terms of sociolinguistic status, then, the picture remains more or less the same as thirty years ago. For further details of the study's methods and results, the reader is referred to Fabricius (2005).

Conclusion

To conclude then, this paper has offered several examples which show that it is fruitful to deconstruct the term RP into two separate but related entities, native and construct RP. By identifying and labelling the two facets of the 'accent entity' RP, we can investigate them individually. Changes in construct RP versus changes in native RP in particular demand separate consideration, without a conceptual blur between the two. The Labovian paradigm can be applied to native RP, while investigating change in construct RP requires somewhat different methods and analyses.

By implication, this paper has also raised the question of what constitutes an accent norm. As the paper has suggested, this is a question whose answer is probably just as complex as what constitutes an accent. We have seen in the latter part of this paper that an accent norm can perhaps be represented as a myriad or multitude of individual judgments, comprising a person's individualized ideas about their own or other people's accents as well as culturally resonant norms, as we see in the commentary by India Knight and the attitude study.

In closing then, it is perhaps worth noting that the contribution a sociolinguistic study of RP can make to the paradigm of sociolinguistics may just as well lie within the area of language norms as in the area of language variation and change.

References

- Abercrombie, David 1965. R. P. and Local accent. *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Adonis, Andrew and Stephen Pollard 1997. *A Class Act: the myth of Britain's classless society*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Altendorf, Ulrike 2003. *Estuary English: Levelling at the Interface of RP and South-Eastern British English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Coupland, Nikolas, S. Sarangi and C. Candlin 2001. *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Cruttenden, Alan 1994. *Gimson's Pronunciation of English*. Fifth edition. London: Arnold.
- Cruttenden, Alan 2001. *Gimson's Pronunciation of English*. Sixth edition. London: Arnold.
- Fabricius, Anne H. 2000. *T-glottalling between stigma and prestige: a sociolinguistic study of modern RP*. Ph.D. thesis, Copenhagen Business School. <http://babel.ruc.dk/~fabri/pdfdocs/Fabricius-2000-PhD-thesis.pdf> (Accessed 24 September 2004)
- Fabricius, Anne H. 2002. RP as sociolinguistic object. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 1(2):355-372.
- Fabricius, Anne. 2005. Investigating speech samples as 'dialect in discourse': discourse analysis, phonetics and language attitudes. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 37:81-99.
- Foulkes, Paul and Gerard J. Docherty, eds. 1999. *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*. London: Arnold.
- Garrett, P., N. Coupland and A. Williams 2003. *Investigating Language Attitudes: Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity and Performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kristiansen, Tore 2001. Two standards: one for the media and one for the school. *Language Awareness*, 10(1):9-24.
- Kroch, Anthony 1995. Dialect and Style in the Speech of Upper Class Philadelphia. In Gregory R. Guy, Crawford Feagin, Deborah Schiffirin and John Baugh. eds. *Towards a social science of language, vol 1. Papers in honour of William Labov..* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 23-45.
- Macaulay, R. 1988. RP R.I.P. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(2):115-124

- Milroy, James. 2001. Received Pronunciation: who “receives” it and how long will it be “received”? *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. 36:15-33.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Lesley and Matthew Gordon. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mugglestone, Lynda. 2003. *Talking proper: the rise of Accent as Social Symbol*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nolan, F. 1999. The shifting sands of English pronunciation. In: Pilvi Rajamäe, ed. *New Britain: The heritage of the past and the challenge of the future*. Proceedings of the 2nd International Tartu Conference on British Studies, University of Tartu, August 24-25 1998.
- Nolan, F. and Paul Kerswill. 1990. The description of connected speech processes. In Susan Ramsaran 1990b. 295-316.
- Ramsaran, Susan. 1990a. RP: fact and fiction. In Susan Ramsaran, ed. 1990b. 178-190.
- Ramsaran, Susan. ed. 1990b. *Studies in the Pronunciation of English: A Commemorative Volume in Honour of A.C. Gimson*. London: Routledge.
- Savage, Mike. 2000. *Class Analysis and Social Transformation*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Straw, Michelle and Peter L. Patrick 2002. (T)-glottalisation among British Anglo and Afro-Caribbean speakers. Paper presented at *Methods XI*, Joensuu, Finland. 5-9 August 2002.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2002. *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wells, J.C. 1982. *Accents of English*. (3 volumes). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, J.C. 1997. What’s happening to Received Pronunciation? *English Phonetics* (English Phonetic Society of Japan). 1:13-23.
- Wells, J.C. 1998. Pinning down Estuary English. Abstract for a lecture given in Lund, Sweden, April 1998. <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/estuary/est-lund.htm> (Accessed 24 September 2004)

Appendix 1: Transcripts of stimulus texts

Transcript H (female RP)

It was very it is or was certainly a very very friendly sort of school no sort of hierarchy very (0.7) laid back because everyone did a lot of different things there was very much of an ethos of letting everybody do what they were good at (.) um while at the same time having very high quality teaching and of course very high quality musical education as well because of the whole background so everybody played an instrument I've played in an orchestra since I was seven eight (0.7) and and all sorts of things because again there was a lot of things to do after school so we were always at school until six, six thirty every night I loved it absolutely loved it (.) and my first teacher was called Miss Perfect she was very a very gifted teacher and very sympathetic while at the same time being (breath) you didn't mess around

Transcript E (female regional)

I went to our local um state primary school so it was like in our catchment area from when I was about six seven no I must have been four to five I was quite young for my year (mm hm) so I think I was four when I started um (0.8) yeah and went on till I was eleven which is like what most people do I loved that that was brilliant I've got really good memories about that good friends and everyone lived in the same sort of area so (0.5) it was quite a liberal school really nice (mm) and relaxed church school (0.4) so there was quite a lot of religious emphasis but not really orthodox or anything like that just relaxed but a lot of church and things involved (mm)

Transcript T (male RP)

There's a infants school which was along one very long corridor (.) with a dining hall at the end and classrooms off it and I don't remember a whole lot about that and (breath) which was sort of separated by a magic white line from junior school (.) the magic white line was the line you weren't

allowed to go over in play time (.) and the junior school had a big hall in the middle and I think about eight classrooms clustered around the sides and (1.0) and there used to be fir trees round it but then they chopped them all down cause they were going to fall down but they've probably planted new ones by now and and I don't know it's about half a mile from where we used to live, so I used to walk to school (.) There's one there's a very good history teacher and a very good English teacher which is two things I've always been interested in since and I did a lot of music so probably I haven't they've had quite a big influence on what I was interested in.

Transcript N (male regional)

Um it had a big central hall and all the other classrooms sort of came off around it and the central hall used to be used for PE and the meals as well () the kitchen was just off to the side and then all the other classrooms sort of adjoined onto the big hall with big fields out the back and a swimming pool () we were really lucky to have a swimming pool (1.2) I remember the headmaster who for most of my time there who was really really nice () my parents loved him and he was the one who said why don't I try for that school I went to afterwards () cause he told me to try for this scholarship and so I did () he used to be really really nice and another one of the teachers was one of my mum's friends so we used to see her a lot a well so those are the people I really remember.

Stephanie Hughes: Bilingualism in North-East France with specific reference to Rhenish Franconian spoken by Moselle Cross-border (or frontier) workers
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
135-153
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Stephanie Hughes and the Editors, 2005

Bilingualism in North-East France with specific reference to Rhenish Franconian spoken by Moselle Cross-border (or frontier) workers

Stephanie Hughes

*University of Antwerp, Belgium
stephanie.hughes@ua.ac.be*

Abstract

This chapter examines the phenomena of bilingualism in the contact zone of the Moselle area of North-East France on the border with the Saarland, where cross-border workers negotiate linguistic identity in the context of interaction with German and French. The study presents an extensive historical background and takes up an empirical investigation of this little-known corner of France, in a survey of language use amongst 120 cross-border workers, conducted in 1998. The consequences of mobility in this case are that the respondents do not find themselves in a stable diglossic situation, but rather in a situation of linguistic flux. There are several micro- and macro-level factors which mitigate against use of Rhenish Franconian dialect in daily life, with the result that dialect is not being spoken to the same extent as it was in the past. There has been a significant decline in the number of native speakers and a progressive erosion of the dialect's underpinning in the community. Hence, this location presents many cultural, social and economic repercussions to be explored. By reporting on the usage of, and attitudes to, the dialect spoken by cross-border workers, the chapter gives a baseline to which future studies may refer in order to track ongoing developments in cross-border workers' use of the Rhenish-Franconian variety within this border region between France and Germany.

Introduction

According to European Union figures, it is estimated that almost 40 million citizens of the Union speak not only the official language of their country but also a regional or minority language that has been passed on from generation to generation. This is the case in the Moselle *département* of the Lorraine region of North-East France. Rather better known examples of this linguistic situation exist elsewhere in France. In addition to the numerous studies on Breton, Basque and Catalan, when focussing on Germanic dialects in particular, it can be seen that Alsatian/Alemannic has been extensively researched by Veltman & Denis (1988), Phillipp (1994), Gardner-Chloros (1991 & 1995), Vassberg (1993) and Geiger-Jaillet (2001) among others. In Northern France, research has been done into Flemish by Ryckeboer & Maeckelberghe (1987), Sansen (1988). According to Euromosaic, current research on Flemish is being conducted in the region by the University of Ghent in Belgium, however this forms part of a study of Dutch dialects in general and does not take any particular account of French Flemish.

A linguistic community in a similar position to that of the Flemish speakers in Northern France are those who speak something which, when examined solely in terms of phonemes, morphemes and lexical structure, is closer to the official or majority language of a neighbouring State, but who live in a country where another language predominates. Rhenish Franconian speakers in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine between Forbach and Bitche, France are in this position and their native tongue and associated cultural heritage are subject to the pressures associated with minority language speakers for their dialect is not currently recognised as a separate '*langue régionale*' by the French government.

When discussing the dialects spoken in the Moselle on a general level, it is important to recognise that, contrary to many popular perceptions including that of the 1999 INSEE/INED survey (Héran *et al.* 2002) where the census referred to the different types of Franconian by either grouping them together under 'Franconian' or using the term 'Lorraine Platt'. there is not one dialect, but rather a group of dialects, including Rhenish Franconian, Moselle Franconian and Luxembourg Franconian, all with one common factor; they are spoken in areas where they are not dialects of the national language.

It is a commonly held belief that the number of those who speak dialect in part of the Moselle *département* of Lorraine is decreasing. A survey carried out by INED (*Institut national des études démographiques*) as part of the 1999 census confirms this. According to INED there has been a decrease in the number of those speaking Franconian in Moselle as a whole. According to Héran *et al.* (2002) reporting results of the 1999 INED/INSEE survey, 'Lorraine Platt' or Franconian appears to be being transmitted less and less among younger generations, because only 20% of those respondents aged less than 15 speak it. According to the 1999 census, there were 78 000 speakers in the *département* of the Moselle, mainly around Thionville, where Luxembourg Franconian and Moselle Franconian, not Rhenish Franconian, is spoken. As previously stated, no distinction was made between Moselle Franconian, Luxembourg Franconian and Rhenish Franconian.

This decrease in the number of speakers will undoubtedly have economic, social and cultural implications for the area, potentially also affecting the *frontaliers*, the cross-border workers who live in the dialect-speaking areas and who work across the border in the Saarland and in the Rhineland Palatinate and in Baden-Württemberg. The potential cultural, social and economic repercussions for cross-border workers in those areas are issues which have not yet been investigated, and which demand fuller investigation.

This analysis of the usage of, and attitudes to, the dialect spoken by cross-border workers in the border area between Forbach and Lemberg in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine carried out in 1998, one year before the 1999 census, serves as a marker to which future studies may refer in order to chart the development of the cross-border workers' use of Rhenish Franconian.

This paper examines the situation in this little-investigated corner of north-east France on the border with the Saarland, Germany and discusses language use amongst cross-border workers.

Fig 1 Area under investigation (linguistic)



Excerpt from Linguistic Map of Alsace-Lorraine published in *Notre avenir est bilingue. Zweisprachig unsere Zukunft* (Strasbourg: René Schickele Kreis, 1968) Map adapted by author.

According to European Treaty No. 78 (1972), the European definition of a cross-border (or frontier) worker is as follows:

Le terme “travailleur frontalier” désigne un travailleur salarié qui est occupé sur le territoire d’une Partie contractante où il retourne en principe chaque jour ou au moins une fois par semaine; toutefois,

- i) dans les rapports entre la France et les Parties contractantes limitrophes, pour être considéré comme travailleur frontalier, l’intéressé doit être occupé et résider dans une zone dont la profondeur n’excède pas, en principe, vingt kilomètres de part et d’autre de la frontière commune;
- ii) le travailleur frontalier occupé sur le territoire d’une Partie contractante par une entreprise dont il relève normalement, qui est détaché par cette entreprise hors de la zone frontalière, soit sur le territoire de la même Partie, soit sur le territoire d’une autre Partie contractante, pour une durée probable n’excédent pas quatre mois, conserve la qualité de frontalier pendant la période de son détachement, dans la limite de quatre mois.

Throughout this paper, there are essentially three viewpoints which must be borne in mind to allow for an unbiased view of the linguistic situation occurring in the Moselle region:

- a) the German linguistic viewpoint, which states that Rhenish Franconian is a German (rather than Germanic) dialect
- b) the French political viewpoint which first listed ‘*Alsacien-Mosellan*’ in the Poignant Report (1998) and both ‘*Lorrain*’ and ‘*dialecte allemand d’Alsace et de Moselle*’ in the Cerquiglini Report (1999) yet did not mention the term ‘Franconian’ until 2002 and
- c) the regional politico-ideological viewpoint which states that the Rhenish Franconian is Germanic, not German.

The socio-political situation

It is interesting to note from the outset that in France, the French language is defined as a symbol of a country’s national unity. As Judge (2000) states, Article Two of the French Constitution reads ‘*La langue de la République est le français*’, and though this was originally the result of a debate around

the anglicisation of the French language, it is interesting to note that the *Assemblée Nationale* now uses a different argument when discussing any amendment to the said Article, namely the threat to the unity of France. When the Rhenish Franconian dialect spoken in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine is considered in the light of these observations, it is clear to see that tensions may arise.

Though the linguistic situation apparent in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine is by no means unique in France, nor in Europe as a whole, it is also interesting to note that the Rhenish Franconian dialect spoken in Moselle has up to now rarely been considered in its own right. In most of the literature hitherto consulted, it is referred to both linguistically and geopolitically as ‘Alsacien’, ‘Alsacien-Mosellan’, ‘dialecte allemande d’Alsace et de Moselle’ or ‘Lorrain’. Moreover, Rhenish Franconian does not appear in the following table on the vitality of minority languages in Europe. (Pooley 2000:132)

Fig. 2 Vitality of Minority Languages in Europe

Category	capaci for reproducti on Scale A to E (Nelde et al , 1996)	Number of speake Nelde et al (1996)	Number of speake cited in Ball (1997) percentage population
Category A*	Catalan (Catalonia)	4,065,000	
	Luxembourgish	350,000	
Category B	Alsacien	1,800,000	1,000,000 (62%)
	Basque (Spain)	544,000	
Category C	Catalan (Roussillon)	150,000	200,000 (56%)
	Frisian (NL)	400,000	
Category D	Basque (France)	86,000	90,000 (39%)
	Corsican	125,000	150,000 (60%)
	Occitan	2,100,000	1,500,000 (12%)
	Breton	180-250,000	600,000 (40%)
	Occitan (Italy)	35-80,000	
Category E	Irish (UK)	142,000	
	Flemish 20-40,000	100,000 (29%)	
	Berber 25.000		
	Cornish 1,000		

The table shows number of speakers and grouped ranking A-E for reproductive potential (Nelde et al. 1996) compared with Kloss and McConnell (1984), Kloss, McConnell and Verdoodt (1989), European Commission (1986) cited in Ball (1997) There is no mention of Franconian.

Pooley goes on to discuss other languages and cites Ball (1997) as stating that 200,000 people speak ‘Frankish (Mosellan)’. It is unclear whether ‘Frankish (Mosellan)’ here should be taken to mean Moselle Franconian as distinct from Rhenish Franconian, in which case Rhenish Franconian is not mentioned or whether it signifies the three different types of Franconian spoken in the Moselle.

In the area of France under investigation, it will be seen that Rhenish Franconian dialect speakers appear to reserve their languages for different functions, dialect in the home, with friends and family, and French in public. This is similar to classic diglossia, but over time, as will be seen, Rhenish Franconian gives way to French. Children end up learning what is perceived as the high variety and leaving the low variety behind. When investigating this part of France, where the native language and the national language are not one and the same, one must recognise the fact that the speakers of the dialect are members of an out-group, and that the native language they speak is

spoken in isolation, with members of the linguistic in-group of the Moselle speaking French. The speakers are not German, and therefore do not have Standard German as the language of the linguistic in-group, unlike the *Saarländer* over the border. In addition, the strong views of the *Académie Française* with regard to the purity of the French language coupled with the second article of the French Constitution stating that the language of the Republic is French, have led to a fascinating linguistic situation.

For many, it would be unthinkable to do as the Moselle cross-border workers do, travel daily to another European country to work, dealing with a different language, different customs and a different political, social and cultural system. The Moselle cross-border workers appear to have a similar culture, identity to, and, currently, a means of communication with their counterparts on the other side of the political border which means that travelling to work over the border in the Saarland is a perfectly normal occurrence for them.

Though the Rhenish Franconian dialect spoken by the cross-border workers in question is linguistically a German dialect, or a dialect of German, the use of the word “German” when discussing a dialect spoken in France still has historical connotations which are sometimes somewhat unwelcome to the people of Moselle. Moreover, the Poignant report on the status of languages in France to the Prime Minister of France in July 1998, states

L’alsacien-mosellan. Cette formulation, qui présente l’intérêt de situer l’aire de diffusion de la langue en question, ne rend pas compte cependant de la répartition territoriale des variétés linguistiques en usage dans les académies de Strasbourg et de Nancy-Metz : l’alémanique et le francique.

Judge (2000) states that though it now appears to be French government policy to label both Alemannic and Franconian as local spoken variants of German, traditionally speakers in the Moselle region have preferred to give Franconian the regional labels of *Platt Lorrain*, *dialecte lorrain* or *dialecte germanique* rather than the label ‘German’ for obvious historical reasons. It is however clear, historically speaking, that Rhenish Franconian has been spoken in the area that is now the Moselle *département* since the Fifth Century. As this is after the Upper Germanic sound shift took place it can be said that Rhenish Franconian is a Middle West Germanic dialect, belonging to the Germanic dialect family, but not a direct descendant of Proto-Germanic.

There are few up-to-date statistical studies on the use of Rhenish Franconian dialect and what little has been written about the decline of the Rhenish Franconian dialect in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine such as work by Laumesfeld (1996) and, on a more prolific scale, about Alemannic in Alsace is often subject to regional bias. Previous studies on Alsace-Lorraine, concentrate almost exclusively on the dialect situation in Alsace and point to a definite shift from the use of dialect to the use of French. Vassberg (1993), echoing Tabouret-Keller (1985) states that many additional field studies are necessary in order to arrive at a more accurate overview of how the dialect situation is developing. Tabouret-Keller states that the existing studies, whilst clearly indicating the fate of the dialect, are too few in number to allow researchers to come to definite conclusions and make assertions based on them and calls for more empirical evidence to broaden the understanding of the complex dynamics of language change in Alsace and Lorraine.

This lack of evidence is far more apparent in Moselle for the following reasons. In Moselle, there is a lack of official written forms of any of the Franconian dialects, whereas in Alsace there is a standardised orthography of Alemannic. To rectify this situation, on May 15th 2004, Albert Hudlett of the University of Mulhouse, Alsace and around forty dialect speakers had their first meeting in

Saint-Avold, Moselle, to attempt to set down a charter for the harmonisation of the orthographies of the different Franconian dialects. The aim of the meeting was to agree the principle of a standard form of orthography from Moselle Franconian speaking Thionville to Rhenish Franconian speaking Bitche with the intention of presenting it to the French Ministry of Education.

In Moselle, there is also an absence of large dialect-speaking towns. Unlike in Alsace, where Strasbourg, Colmar and Mulhouse still have a significant proportion of dialect-speakers, in Lorraine, Metz and Nancy are almost exclusively French-speaking. In Alsace, Duée (2002) carried out a study which showed the apathy of the younger generations to the dialect, however no comprehensive research has been done in Moselle with the exception of a general survey linked to the March 1999 census entitled “Family History Survey” which resulted in a paper by Héran *et al.* (2002) examining language transmission in France in the course of the 20th Century in which, for the first time, ‘*Platt Lorrain*’ figures in the list of languages as an entry in its own right.

The book edited by Treffers-Daller & Willemyns (2002) which brings together sociolinguistic analyses of language contact along the Romance-Germanic language border, shedding light on the variable and universal elements in language contact and shift does not, as is claimed, cover the whole range of the border, from French Flanders through to South Tyrol. Though there is comprehensive coverage of Flemish in the North of France, the Flemish-French language border in Belgium, language use and language contact in Brussels, German in Belgium with specific reference to linguistic variation from a contact linguistic point of view, Luxembourg, as a multilingual society on the Romance/Germanic language border, the book then jumps geographically to Alsace, before continuing its journey southwards examining the German-Romance language borders in Switzerland, and German and Italian in South Tyrol. There is no separate mention of either Moselle Franconian or Rhenish Franconian spoken in the Moselle *département* of Lorraine.

Though Lorraine has its own sense of cultural identity which is not as strong as that of Alsace, the situation in Lorraine mirrors that of the rather better known Alsace region to some extent. According to Simmer (1995) the roots of the dialect in the current Moselle *département* of France can be traced back to the Fifth Century and the events of the past 250 years have defined the dialect speaking area of Moselle, Lorraine. The current political borders of the Moselle are recent and the *département* is divided into two by a linguistic border. This linguistic border coupled with the factor that there is no large dialect-speaking town sets the Moselle apart from the two *départements* (Bas-Rhin and Haut-Rhin) of Alsace and makes it unique. The Moselle dialect-speaking towns of Thionville and Forbach both lie in an area rich in natural mineral resources. Forbach lies in the coal basin, Sarreguemines is the home of the pottery industry and Bitche is not only a rich area of natural resources, but also had a good income from the crystal works, thus making the area under investigation part of an economically very sought after, and fought over, area. The recent crises in the coal and steel industries have, however, had a profound economic effect on the area leading to an increased number of people from the area under investigation seeking their fortune across the border in the Saarland.

Linguistic identity and geographic situation

With regard as to whether the linguistic community under investigation in this part of the Moselle *département* of Lorraine is bilingual or diglossic, Ferguson (1959:325-340) states that ‘Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body

of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation'. Ferguson's definition states that in order for a linguistic community to be described as diglossic then there must be the side-by-side existence of two structurally and historically related language varieties (a High variety and a Low variety, referred to as H and L) throughout a community, each of which has a distinct role. Contrary to Ferguson, Fishman (1967:29-38) hypothesised that diglossia could occur in any situation where two language varieties, even unrelated ones, are used in functionally distinct ways. Though Hudson(1996) pointed out that Fishman's reformulation of the concept of diglossia is problematic, because the direction of language evolution in a classic diglossic situation is opposite to that apparent in the case of widespread bilingualism it is clear that when instances of languages in contact are considered, where, unlike Ferguson's theory, the contact in question is not between two varieties L and H of the same language but two different languages, then Fishman's language evolution theory (L/H \rightarrow H) holds true. In almost all situations of societal bilingualism, the L language loses ground to the H language which is usually spoken by those in economic and political power. Pooley (2000:142-143), discussing regional languages in France states that Ferguson's view of diglossia as being stable is a rare exception as most cases of societal bi- or multilingualism show considerable instability and more open manifestations of tensions and individual speaker choice in the face of perceived norms. Pooley also rejects Fishman's perspective of diglossia as a social phenomenon and bilingualism as a psycholinguistic issue. He reasons that 'bilinguals need the communicative competence to know when to use the varieties at their disposal appropriately'.

Rhenish Franconian currently enjoys little of the prestige of the French language, nor of the Standard German language. As Jan Goosens (1977:51) states,


Will man die germanischen Dialekte dieser Randgebiete "deutsch" nennen, so kann man das auch nicht ausschließlich auf Grund der Feststellung, dass sie eine gewisse Ähnlichkeit mit der deutschen Hochsprache aufweisen, die es ermöglicht, sie mit Hilfe einer Anzahl von Regeln daraus abzuleiten. Das würde voraussetzen, dass eine Übereinstimmung zwischen zwei Sprachsystemen a und b genügt, das eine (a) als zum anderen (b) gehörig zu betrachten, ohne dass dieses Verhältnis umgekehrt werden könnte.

If, as Goosens quotes Francescato (1965) as saying, "Dialects do not belong to a language, they 'are' a language", then it could be argued that they can be considered German dialects if German is the language normally used alongside the dialect, thereby fulfilling the sociological and political dimension. This is not the case in the Rhenish-Franconian dialect-speaking part of the Moselle, where French is the national language. Russ (1994) states that spoken language is multifaceted, and that there may also be the question, albeit unspoken, of the status of participants in any dialogue. For instance they may be equal, as in a dialogue between friends, or one may be in the role of authority, for example, someone asking a question or making a transaction at a government office. This may affect the use of not only the register of language, but also the (sub)conscious decision of whether to use standard speech or dialect. In this paper, Russ' observations are substantiated, but it must be noted from the outset that where switching between languages occurs in the home of the cross-border workers, it is between French and Rhenish Franconian. Over the border at work in the Saarland, between standard German with those in authority and Rhenish Franconian or French with cross-border colleagues.

Geographical area under investigation

From the following map it can be seen that the Forbach, Sarreguemines, Volmunster, Bitche area of the Moselle département of France are within easy commuting distance of the Saarland.

Fig 3



According to private correspondence with the cross-border workers' association '*Association des frontaliers Moselle-Est*' based in Sarreguemines, the most common destination for cross-border workers from the Sarreguemines area working in the Saarland is the Saarpfalzkreis and its main town, Homburg.

According to statistics published by INSEE in late 1999, the number of cross-border workers increased as illustrated in the following table during the eight years before the survey was carried out.

Fig. 4 Movement of Lorraine cross-border workers

Division of cross-border workers into place of work	1990	1998	1999 (e)	Increase 1990-1999	Increase 1998-1999
Luxembourg	14,350	35,100	38,900	+24,550	+ 3,800
Germany	15,300	22,400	22,900	+ 7,600	+ 500
Belgium	1,350	2,800	2,800	+ 1,450	0
Total	31,000	60,300	64,600	+33,600	+ 4,300

(e) Estimated figures drawn from INSEE, Arbeitsamt, Sécurité Sociale Luxembourgeoise, INAMI Belge, CPAM

From the previous table, it can be seen that whilst in 1990, there were 950 more Lorraine cross-border workers employed in Germany than in Luxembourg, the figures for 1998, the year the author conducted the survey, show that there were 12,700 more Lorraine cross-border workers employed in Luxembourg than in Germany. Whilst the total number of cross-border workers employed in Luxembourg had nearly doubled (from 31,000 to 60,300) in the period from 1990 to 1998, the number of those employed in Germany had only increased by 7,100 in that period. Whilst the number of cross-border workers had doubled in the space of nine years, the different employment areas in Lorraine benefited to different degrees from this increase. The increase in the number of cross-border workers finding employment benefited the Moselle by 73% for two reasons. The first is the length of the border, stretching from Thionville in the north of the area to Bitche in the south. This border makes up 80% of the Lorraine border. The second is the development of the flow of

cross-border workers. In 1999 the area from which the cross-border workers were prepared to travel to Luxembourg increased in size southward. In comparison to the Moselle, the *département* of Meurthe-et-Moselle hardly benefited from the increase in the number of cross-border workers at all, due to its geographical location.


According to figures for 2000, published in September 2001 jointly by the five offices responsible for statistics in the cross-border region, the current total number of cross-border workers working in the Saarland and living in Moselle has then reached 24,638. Though this is an increase compared to the published figures for 1998, it is far smaller than the increase in the number of cross-border workers commuting to work in Luxembourg in 2000, (46,430). According to statistics published in 2003 by the Statistisches Landesamt Rheinland-Pfalz, from 2000 to 2001, the number of cross-border workers from the Lorraine crossing into the Saarland to work increased modestly, from 24,638 to 25,900. The number travelling to Luxembourg once again increased by a higher percentage, from 46,430 to 52,000 as can be seen on the following map.

Fig. 5 Cross-border workers movement 2001

GRENZÜBERSCHREITENDE BERUFSPENDLER

TRAVAILLEURS FRONTALIERS

2001



Statistisches Landesamt Rheinland-Pfalz

Given the state of unemployment in the Moselle, it is important to note that many cross-border workers have been able to find work in large companies in the Saarpfalzkreis, such as Bosch, Michelin, Schaeffler, due, in part, to the fact that they speak the Rhenish Franconian dialect. The third favourite destination for all Lorraine cross-border workers, but the most popular destination for the Moselle cross-border workers under investigation, is the Saarpfalzkreis, which attracted approximately 2700 cross-border workers according to a 1999 INSEE report. The cross-border workers working in the Saarpfalzkreis are mainly employed in industry and more particularly in metalwork (Bosch, Schaeffler, Krupp-Gerlach) or in the production of tyres (Michelin). This industrial specificity explains why the area under investigation appeals to more male than female cross-border workers.

The reasons for choosing to look at the dialect spoken in Moselle are outlined in the introduction to this paper. For practical reasons, it was decided that the research would focus on the current linguistic situation of the cross-border workers in the area between Forbach and Lemberg working across the border in the Saarpfalzkreis. Compared to other groups of dialect-speakers, the group chosen was homogenous, compact and more accessible to the author than other groups of dialect speakers. The group chosen is representative of cross-border workers in the area, and the results provide a picture of their language use and attitudes towards the languages they use. It was decided to target this group, as they are the people who potentially need the Rhenish Franconian dialect most of all. In theory, they use it as a working language, as a means of communicating, not only with their families but also with their employers and fellow-workers across the border in the Saarland. It must be stated at this point that the views of the subgroup chosen may not be representative of dialect speakers in the Moselle in general, as it was expected that the dialect would be more richly maintained by the cross-border workers than by other groups. It is however clear that the subgroup is representative of those cross-border workers who go to Germany, and who need to use dialect as a working language.

The official statistics for 1998 indicate that the number of cross-border workers living in the area under investigation and working over the border in the Saarpfalzkreis is 2500. Estimates from the “*Association des Frontaliers Moselle-Est*”, the cross-border workers’ association based in Sarreguemines, put the total number of those working in the Saarpfalzkreis at about 2800, a figure which may include some of those working under the then DM630 rule (€315) and thus not part of the target group.

Like Schorr (1998), the author relied on the self-assessment of the cross-border workers surveyed. In contrast to Schorr’s approach however, the author decided to implement delivery/collection questionnaires in order to increase the sample size, to choose a larger quota sample, according to age and gender breakdown, from a much smaller geographical area in order to increase the robustness of the sample data. The advantage of the delivery/collection questionnaire over a postal survey was that the author had easier access to the respondents. The questionnaire research focused solely on cross-border workers, most of whom are bilingual dialect/French speakers. Since the research chooses to sample the dialect usage and attitudes of cross-border workers, working in Germany, only those respondents who stated that they could understand French were asked to fill out the questionnaires. The sample of respondents chosen was representative of Moselle cross-border workers from this area working in the Saarpfalzkreis. All of the respondents live in the areas of Sarreguemines, Bitche and Saaralbe with many living in villages such as Lemberg and Montbronn. The general profile of the respondents surveyed corresponds to the average profile of the cross-border worker provided to the author by the *Association des frontaliers Moselle Est* in Sarreguemines. The questionnaire developed for this research was patterned on those used in previous language use and language attitude surveys by Jon Amastae (1978), Wolfgang Ladin (1982), and Liliane Vassberg (1993) and was revised once in the light of comments from the Personnel Directors during the semi-structured interviews and again in the light of a pilot survey. All questionnaires were in French and consisted of questions where the respondent had to give a numerical answer, depending on his or her response.

What follows is a brief summary of some of the research findings based on delivery/collection survey response data from 120 respondents, each of whom answered sixty-nine questions on their language use and twenty-three questions on their attitudes to Rhenish Franconian. The results which follow examine what the respondents themselves report is happening. The author does not attempt to answer the question “Why is this happening?” in great detail, for unlike anthropological research, such survey data does not usually provide information about cultural values and it is

therefore necessary to take into account other measurable causes such as migration, urbanisation, or economic shifts which are outside the remit of this research.

General findings

One comment encapsulated the views:

Moi, je suis frontalier et je comprends le Platt, mon père l'était et il parlait le Platt, mais mon fils...lui il ne parle pas le Platt, alors je ne sais pas...il n'y a pas de boulot pour les jeunes ici alors il doit aller sur Metz pour en trouver.

The majority of the respondents were male, and, in the case of the older cross-border workers, generally left school after primary school. The younger cross-border workers generally started work after finishing secondary school and/or technical school. Most respondents were either dialect-speaking, or, as in the case of younger respondents, capable of understanding the dialect. One thirty-five year-old cross-border worker wrote the following unsolicited comment on the questionnaire regarding the implications of a breakdown in communication for the cross-border workers from Moselle unable to speak the dialect.

Il y aura une barrière, si cette barrière n'existe pas déjà. S'ils n'ont pas un moyen de compréhension avec les chefs, ils peuvent se faire exploiter. Ça peut être aussi un problème pour certains pour trouver un emploi en Sarre car il n'y aura pas de moyen de communication orale.'

The results of the survey showed some interesting trends. It was interesting to note, for example, that the findings of the survey correlated with those of other surveys done in Alsace, and that the younger the interlocutor was, the more likelihood there was that the respondents, though often perfectly capable of speaking dialect, would nevertheless speak French. This does not bode well for the future of the dialect, as the survey has shown that though the dialect is still spoken at home with grandparents, it is not spoken so frequently with partners, and less still with the respondents' children in the area under investigation. It is also important to note that sometimes the respondents' attitudes belie their behaviour. The following graph indicates what the current situation is with regard to the transmission of the dialect.





Fig. 6

It can be seen from the above graph that where a total of less than 10 per cent of respondents generally or only use the dialect as a means of communication with their children, where the same cross-border workers were asked to state their feelings with regard to the transmission of the dialect,

58.3 per cent agreed completely and a further 26.6 per cent agreed with the statement that parents should teach dialect to their children.

Fig. 7



General language use in the street mirrors that used at home, in the case of the incidence of dialect used with senior citizens and with children. The picture painted by the respondents' answers indicates that the younger generations do not have the same linguistic profile, and that the children of bilingual parents are being brought up monolingually, due to the prestige of the French language and the lack of support for, or interest in the dialect at the time of the survey. Again, this does not bode well for the future of the dialect. Moreover, any contact with the authorities, for example, the police, is mainly carried out in French. From the respondents' answers, it appears that the dialect is not as commonly used with children as with senior citizens.

In commerce, the language of preference is French, above all in large shops and with market traders. One reason for this is that the respondents are not necessarily aware of the linguistic profile of their interlocutor, and therefore often choose the language of communication most likely to be mutually understandable, French. It is interesting to note that when the respondent is aware of the linguistic profile of their interlocutor, such as when talking to a friend in the same situation, then there is a higher incidence of dialect use.

In other situations in Moselle outside work, the language spoken often depends on either the situation, the respondents' knowledge of the linguistic profile of the interlocutor or both. It is interesting to note once again, that the respondents' language use often changes depending on the situation they find themselves in. If they feel the need to use French, either because their interlocutor is using it, or because it carries more weight in a particular situation, then they will code-switch. In a bank or in a café, the respondent is more likely to use French than dialect with the bank teller or waiter. With friends in the same situation, the respondents tend to use more dialect. It is as if the dialect-speakers belong to an in-group, and the in-group only admits other members when it is sure that they belong to the group, i.e. that they are dialect-speakers.

Many interviewees bemoaned the current employment situation in and around Sarreguemines, but again, they did not appear to be concerned for the future of cross-border employment. One younger cross-border worker boasted of the fact he had obtained employment in the Saarland via a private employment agency although he did not speak dialect and only spoke schoolboy German. When asked how he communicated, he shrugged his shoulders and said that there were other cross-border workers who translated for him if necessary, but that it was not often necessary because others on his part of the production line were also cross-border workers, so he could speak to them in French. At work in the Saarland, the respondents identify with the in-group more than when they are in

Moselle . This becomes apparent when they respond that they speak German, rather than dialect in situations such as with superiors or with colleagues or employees, i.e. with those who consider the respondents to be their superiors. Despite the fact that the dialect of the Saarland and the dialect of the respondents are, in the main, mutually intelligible, the respondents make a distinction between what they speak with others from Moselle , the other members of the in-group, and what they speak with the Germans, the members of the out-group. Many of the dialect speakers appear to be as comfortable switching from dialect to German as from dialect to French.

When questions were asked with regard to specific subjects in such a way that it was clear that the interlocutor was a dialectophone, the main factor contributing to the decision whether to use French or dialect was the availability or lack of subject-specific vocabulary at the respondents' disposal. Where the subject matter was technical, and there were fewer dialect expressions, there was a greater tendency to use French. If the subject was one which the respondents had learnt about at school, such as religion, or one they had learnt about from the media, through the medium of French, such as politics, then there was a higher tendency to use French.

This confirms the views expressed by Hughes (1987) when considering the newspaper *France Journal*, which, though published in German, was geared to an ever ageing dialect-speaking readership. Though the newspaper published articles in German, they contained French vocabulary specific to their readership who read about “*der Maire*” “*die députés*”, etc. Even then, the dialect speakers were reading French terms.

Generally, the respondents selected the television programmes they want to watch for reasons other than linguistic ones. They are as undiscerning when listening to the radio. Few mentioned the existence of the dialect radio station, Studio Bitche. Younger respondents chose to listen to French music stations, rather than the dialect radio station which broadcasts to the local area. Press reading habits varied, the younger respondents read newspapers in French, older respondents read either French or German, and several respondents mentioned the demise of the German language regional newspaper, *France Journal*, which had served the needs of those who speak dialect and could read German. These respondents now rely on the regional French language newspaper, *Le Républicain Lorrain*, for their news.

When asked about language use with a specific aim in mind, it became clear that in some cases there was no conscious decision to switch, and the switching which took place was often arbitrary. For some respondents, the use of French versus dialect became a use of French or dialect depending on the aim to be achieved. When being flattering, for example, respondents were more likely to use French, again because of the vocabulary, but potentially also because of the prestige of the language.

Conclusions and perspectives

These survey findings go some way to illuminating a little-investigated corner of France where the national language and the native tongue are not always one and the same and give an insight into linguistic and cultural diversity amongst cross-border workers for whom the idea of mobility of the labour force and the situation of languages in contact are part of daily life.

The conclusions to be drawn from the history of the area prior to the last five years and the evidence presented in the survey results are bleak as it has been seen that dialects will begin to form whenever there is a barrier or other factor (economic, religious, political, etc.) isolating one group from another. If, as appears to be the case in the Rhenish Franconian speaking area, there is

evidence of the Rhenish Franconian-speaking group being in an inferior or weaker position than that of the French-speaking group then it is logical that French will predominate over time, providing there is little effort on the part of the Rhenish Franconian speakers to defend their language. Given the lack of support accorded to their dialect prior to the Cerquiglini Report of 1999 in which '*Lorraine*' was mentioned for the first time, it is understandable that the respondents do not find themselves in a stable diglossic situation, but rather in a situation of linguistic flux. Differences have arisen between the prestige and use of dialects in Alsace and in Lorraine, because the groups are developing their dialects separately with different levels of support. According to Henriette Walter writing in Blanchet et al (1999: 15-24) "The situation of Alsace is far stronger than that of Lorraine as regards its traditional language." Conversely, although dialects of the same language will merge and homogenise when brought into contact again, this is not likely to happen in Lorraine because the dialect and the national language are not similar and Rhenish Franconian dialect is now spoken, almost as a 'badge of honour' amongst middle-aged and older inhabitants of the Moselle region.

When a dialect spoken in an area is not a dialect of the national language, then the national language may eventually dominate if it is perceived by the population to be the 'more important' means of communication. A dialect can "convert" speakers of another dialect by being identified with a group of power or money, either because of the need to communicate with that group or in order to imitate it. Conversely, a dialect will lose speakers if the group it is identified with loses its prestige or if another (e.g. standard) dialect can be used to communicate with it. If a dialect attracts speakers because of its association with some group and manages to keep them for a sufficiently long time, then at some point the importance of the association wanes. If the prestige of the group falls after this point, that alone will not greatly affect the number of speakers given that the dialect is spoken as a dialect of the national language also spoken in the area.

Where, however, the dialect is not a dialect of the national language, and the national language is deemed to be of greater value or more important, then a situation such as that which is developing in Rhenish Franconian speaking Moselle will occur, where the dialect is superseded by French. As confirmed by the survey results, the younger generation are clearly not all capable of speaking the dialect of their grandparents, or even, in some cases, their parents, and where they do not consider it important to speak it.

Trask (1997) states that one might ask why individuals do not simply remain bilingual, learning and using their traditional language at home and using the local prestige language with outsiders. In Moselle, it takes a great effort to maintain Rhenish Franconian. It becomes increasingly expedient for dialect-speakers to slip into the prestige language in all domains, precisely because the prestige language, French is the language of education, publishing, broadcasting, films, and the law. Trask adds that many minority-language speakers are currently trying to maintain a policy of bilingualism despite these considerable pressures. Increased communications may also encourage the development of a 'standard' language to bridge the dialects and languages as has been seen with the use of English as a language of communication on the Internet. Having seen the results of this survey, and the attitudes of the younger generation to the dialect, viewed by many as '*une langue des vieux*' one may ask the question whether, in the generations to come, the language of communication between the people of Moselle and their neighbours in Germany will not be a different one, English. Already, amongst the younger generation there are those of dialect speaking parents who no longer speak the dialect themselves, and for whom English is their first foreign language, rather than German. It is also important to note that across the border in the Saarland, which, as a legacy of the Second World War, traditionally taught French as the first foreign language, schools now have the choice between English and French as the first foreign language

and, according to Klaus Zeßner, *Bürgermeister* of Homburg/Saar and former Headmaster of the *Staatliches Saarpfalzgymnasium Homburg* more than 50% choose English.

It is clear from the results of the survey that Rhenish Franconian is clearly not being spoken to the same extent as it was in the past. As in other regions of France where dialects, or 'regional languages' are spoken, there has been a significant decline in the number of native-speakers and a progressive erosion of the underpinning in the community. There is clear evidence of increased use of French, not only depending on circumstance but also depending on the age of the interlocutor. The evidence clearly suggests that the use of the dialect is not as widespread amongst younger generations as amongst older ones. Pooley (2000) states that with regard to general competence in regional languages the speakers of regional languages are clearly on the wrong side of the young-old, urban-rural divide. Speakers of Rhenish Franconian spoken in the Moselle are certainly in this category as the research by Héran *et al* (2002) shows.

The cross-border workers' attitudes to their dialect also indicate that they feel that the younger generations do not have the same mastery of the dialect as they themselves do. This view is substantiated by François Clanché of INSEE (2002) discussing the initial results of the 1999 census.

Les langues régionales se transmettent de moins en moins. Si la transmission des langues étrangères a légèrement progressé tout au long du siècle, il n'en est pas de même des langues régionales: avant 1930, une personne sur quatre parlait une langue régionale avec ses parents, le plus souvent de façon habituelle. Cette proportion passe à une personne sur dix dans les années 1950, puis une sur vingt dans les années 1970. De plus, depuis le milieu des années 1950, les langues régionales sont deux fois plus souvent reçues comme langue occasionnelle que comme langue habituelle. La tendance ne s'est pas retournée dans les années 1980 et 1990. Les enfants nés durant cette période n'ont pas été interrogés à l'enquête, n'ayant pas atteint 18 ans. Mais leur faible contact avec les langues régionales peut être appréhendé indirectement: 3 % seulement des adultes interrogés ayant des enfants nés durant cette période disent leur avoir parlé une langue régionale. La probabilité d'avoir été élevé dans une langue régionale est multipliée par dix pour les natifs de Corse ou d'Alsace. Elle est également plus élevée qu'ailleurs pour les natifs des Pyrénées-Atlantiques, des Pyrénées-Orientales, de la Moselle, du Finistère ou des Côtes-d'Armor. Le simple fait d'être né dans le même département que ses deux parents augmente aussi la probabilité d'avoir reçu d'eux une langue régionale, de même que le fait d'avoir eu des parents ouvriers, ou plus encore agriculteurs.

The attitudes of the survey respondents towards the use of the dialect clearly indicate that, without support from the authorities and without a change in attitude from those who are currently speaking French to their children, it is only a matter of time before the linguistic border will shift yet further towards the political Franco-German border. Given the current industrial infrastructure in this particular area of the dialect-speaking Moselle *département* of Lorraine, and excepting major investment in the area in years to come, future generations of cross-border workers will, no doubt still make the journey to the Saarland to work. The language of communication remains a very different question. Hughes (1987) predicted that the French news, German language newspaper France Journal would cease publication, and two years later, it did. It may well be that, unlike their ancestors, the future generations of cross-border workers will have learnt German as a foreign language at school, just as they currently learn English, and that they still perceive German to be important, if not a necessary in order to find employment over the border. Yet, without increased support, Rhenish Franconian spoken in the Moselle *département* may become, before too long, perceived as '*la langue du voisin*' rather than the native tongue of the cross-border workers' ancestors. Measures are now being put in place to encourage cultural and economic co-operation

between the two regions, but it remains to be seen whether the dialect spoken in the border region of Moselle will remain the working language of those who travel to the Saarland for employment. Despite the decision of the *Assemblée Nationale* not to support the Bill of November 21 2002 to amend Article Two of the Constitution to include mention of the defence and support of 'regional languages' it would appear that the picture is now slightly less negative than it was at the time the survey was carried out. This is thanks to a certain number of measures put in place by the *Conseil Régional* to support cross-border initiatives and to evidence of recent increased awareness of and support for the Rhenish Franconian dialect spoken in the eastern part of the Moselle *département*.

As Louis-Jean Calvet (1999) states

De quelles langues les humains ont-ils besoins? Nous avons tous besoin de trois types de langues. Notre langue identitaire, celle que nous parlons dans notre environnement immédiat, en famille ou avec les amis. La langue de l'État, celle qui nous permet d'accéder à la vie politique et sociale. Et enfin une langue de communication internationale. Ces trois fonctions peuvent s'incarner dans trois langues différentes, dans deux ou dans une seule.

Whether Rhenish Franconian will continue to be used by cross-border workers in the immediate environment, with family and friends, and, indeed as a 'working language' and whether future generations of cross-border workers will indeed use it with their children, only time will tell, but, without continued effort to promote it and to encourage the younger generations to speak it, the future does not look promising. It is to be hoped that support for Rhenish Franconian will increase and that it may one day achieve the status currently accorded to the dialects of Alsace.

References

- Amastae, J. 1978. 'Sociolinguistic Background of PAU students' in *Proceedings of the Seventh Southwest Area Language and Linguistics Workshop*, Boulder: University of Colorado
- Atamaniuk, Hervé 1998. *Note de travail de la Fédération pour le Lothringer Platt, à l'intention de Mme la députée Nicole Péry, chargée d'un rapport sur les langues et cultures régionales*
- Barbour, Stephen and Patrick Stevenson 1990. *Variation in German, A critical approach to German sociolinguistics*, Cambridge University Press
- Bortignon, E., D. Laumesfeld, S. Mebarki, J.P. Ruiz 1987. *Les Passagers du Solstice*, Metz: Editions Serpenoise
- Ball, R. 1997. *The French Speaking World*. London: Routledge
- Bothorel-Witz, A. et D. Huck 1995. Des variétés dialectales aux locuteurs dialectophones alsaciens: état d'une recherche géo- et sociolinguistique. In J-F. Bonnot ed., *Paroles régionales: Normes, variétés linguistiques et contexte social*, pp. 45-96.
- Bothorel-Witz, A. 1995. Vers une redéfinition des dialectes alsaciens? Des concepts catégoriques aux variétés d'un espace plurilingue. In J-F. Bonnot ed., *Paroles régionales: Normes, variétés linguistiques et contexte social*, pp. 217-252).
- Boulangier, G. 1987. *Histoire d'une langue: le Francique*. Bouzonville: Gau un Griis
- Brasme, Pierre 2000. *La population de la Moselle (1815-1914)*, Metz: Editions Serpenoise
- Calvet, L.J. 1999. *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon
- Cerquiglini, Bernard 1999. *Les Langues de la France Rapport au Ministre de l'Education Nationale, de la Recherche et de la Technologie, et à la Ministre de la Culture et de la Communication*. C.N.R.S. April 1999
- Christophory, J. 1978. *Les Luxembourgeois par eux-mêmes*, Luxembourg.
- Clanche, François 2002 *Langues régionales, langues étrangères: de l'héritage à la pratique* Division Enquêtes et études démographiques, Paris: INSEE
- Clyne, Michael 1984. *Language and Society in the German-speaking Countries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cocher, C. 1999. Frontaliers lorrains: '4000 emplois de plus.' in *Économie Lorraine*, no. 192, Décembre 1999: 12-14
- Cocher, C. et J.-L. van Gheluwe 2001. 'De plus en plus de frontaliers au nord-est de la France.' in *Économie Lorraine*, no. 208 - Mai 2001: 19-22
- Duee, M. (2002) 'L'Alsacien, deuxième langue régionale de France' in *Chiffres pour L'Alsace* Revue no 12, INSEE Strasbourg, December 2002
- Dörrenbächer, P. et W. Brücher 2000 'Espace transfrontalier et culture mixte: l'exemple Sarro-Lorrain.' in *Géographie et cultures* 36, December 2000: 57-70

- Dörrenbächer, P. et C. Schulz 1999. Cultural and Regional Integration. The Case of the Saar-Lor-Lux Cross-Border Labour Market. In: Koter, M. and K. Heffner eds., *Multicultural Regions and Cities*, Łódź 125-139
- European Treaties (1972) ETS No. 78 *European agreement on Social Security* Paris December 14 1972
- Fasold, R. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Ferguson, C. A. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15:325-340
- Fishman, J. A. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia, diglossia with and without bilingualism. *The Journal of Social Issues* 23:29-38
- Fishman, J.A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. 2001. *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? «Reversing language shift» revisited: a 21st century perspective*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fourquet, Jean 1968. La situation linguistique en Allemagne, in André Martinet, *Le langage*. Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard
- Fourquet, Jean 1969. Langue. Dialecte. Patois, in André Martinet, *Le langage*
- Francescato, G. 1965 'Structural comparison, diasystems and dialectology' *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 81:484-491
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 1995. Code-switching in community, regional and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken, eds. *One Speaker, Two Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 68-90.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 1991 *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Geiger-Jaillet, A. 2001. *Nationale, regionale und sprachliche Grenzen. Das Saar-Lor-Lux-Modell*, Asgard Verlag (Bausteine Europas VIII)
- Goossens, Jan 1977. *Deutsche Dialektologie*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter
- Goudallier, Jean-Pierre 1981. *Phonologie fonctionnelle et phonétique expérimentale. Exemples empruntés au luxembourgeois*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske
- Grimes, Barbara 2000. *Ethnologue: languages of the world*, Dallas, Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2 volumes, see website www.ethnologue.com.
- Guelen, E. 1939. *Die deutschlothringischen Mundarten*, Forbach
- Hartweg, F. 1996. Sur les brisées du dialecte. *Saisons d'Alsace*, 133, 20-26.
- Hawkins, John A. 1990 "Germanic Languages", in Bernard Comrie, ed. *The Major Languages of Western Europe*, London: Routledge (1st Editio, London: Croom Helm, 1987)
- Héran, F. ,A. Filhon et C. Deprez 2002. Language transmission in France in the course of the 20th Century. *Population & Sociétés* No. 376 February 2002
- Hudson, R.A. 1996. *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hughes, S.P. 1987. Platt and France Journal, struggle for survival: unpublished final year thesis, Coventry Polytechnic
- Hughes, S.P. 2000. Germanic dialect spoken in Lorraine with reference to the use of dialect by cross-border workers in Germany and Luxembourg, in G. Newton ed. *Essays on Politics, Language and Society in Luxembourg*. New York Ceredigion, The Edwin Mellen Press
- Judge, A. 2000. 'France: One state, one nation, one language?' in S. Barbour and C. Carmichael, eds., *Language and Nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Krier, Fernande 1996. "Variétés et normes linguistiques", *Actes du 21e colloque international de Linguistique Fonctionnelle*, Iași
- Ladin, W. 1982. *Der elsässische Dialekt - museumsreif?* Strasbourg: SALDE
- Laumesfeld, Daniel, Marielle Rispail et Didier Atamaniuk 1984. "Le francique", in: Henri Giordan, ed. *Par les langues de France vol. 1*, Paris: Centre Georges-Pompidou
- Laumesfeld, Daniel 1984. *La diglossie en Lorraine luxembourgeophone. Pratiques, idéologies*, Thèse 3e cycle, Université Paris V.
- Laumesfeld, Daniel 1996. *La Lorraine francique, culture mosaïque et dissidence linguistique*. Paris and Montréal : Editions L'Harmattan
- Martinet, André ed. 1968, *Le langage*. Paris: Gallimard. Encyclopédie de la Pléiade
- Muller, Jean-Claude 1992. "Le Luxembourg. Du dialecte à la langue nationale: le luxembourgeois", in José Carlos Herreras, ed. 1992. *Situations linguistiques dans les pays de la Communauté européenne*, Valenciennes: Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes.
- Muller, Pierre 2001. "La Lorraine mise en regard de la France de 1975 à 1999", *Economie lorraine*, n° 206, p. 8-13, March 2001
- Philipp, Marthe 1994. "L'espace lexical haut-rhinois: essai d'analyse systématique" *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 109
- Philipp, Marthe 1991. *La Moselle germanophone*, Paris: Moselle
- Philipp, Marthe, Arlette Bothorel et Guy Levieuge 1977. *Atlas linguistique et ethnographique de la Lorraine germanophone*, CNRS

- Poignant, Bernard 1998. *Langues et Cultures Regionales. Rapport à Monsieur Lionel Jospin, Premier Ministre* Paris, 1 July 1998
- Raynaud, Franziska 1982. *Histoire de la langue allemande*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, coll. "Que sais-je?", n° 1952
- Pooley, T. 2000. 'Sociolinguistics, regional varieties of French and regional languages in France' *French Language Studies* 10:117-157
- Rene-Schickele-Kreis 1968. *Notre avenir est bilingue. Zweisprachig unsere Zukunft*.t Strasbourg
- Russ, C.V.J. 1994. *The German language today: A linguistic introduction*. London: Routledge
- Ryckebøer, H. And L. Maeckelberghe 1987. Dialect en Cultuurtaal aan weerszijden van de rijksgrens in de Westhoek. *De Franse Nederlanden/Les Pays-Bas Français, Jaarboek/Annales* 12 :129-151.
- Saar-Lor-Lux-Rheinland-Pfalz-Wallonie. *Statistische Kurzinformationen* 2001. Bad Ems: Statistisches Landesamt <http://www.statistik.rlp.de>
- Saar-Lor-Lux-Rheinland-Pfalz-Wallonie. *Statistische Kurzinformationen/Statistiques en bref. Saar-Lor-Lux-Rhénanie-Palatinat occidental-Wallonie. Statistiques en bref* 2003. Bad Ems: Statistisches Landesamt, Koblenz: Görres http://www.grande-region.lu/html_fr/
- Sansen, J. 1988. Le flamand. Une langue-frontière mal connue. In G. Vermes ed., *Vingt-cinq communautés linguistiques de la France, tome I. Langues régionales et langues nonterritorialisées*. Paris: L'Harmattan. pp. 169–187
- Schorr, A. 1998. "Grenzregionen und Interferenzräume" in: Reinhard Schneider ed., *Grenzgänger*. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag
- Simmer, Alain 1995. *L'origine de la frontière linguistique en Lorraine: la fin des mythes?* Knutange: Fensch-Vallée
- Tabouret-Keller, A. 1985. *Le Français en Alsace: Actes du Colloque de Mulhouse*. Geneva: Editions Slatkine
- Tonnelat, Ernest 1927. *Histoire de la langue allemande*, Paris: Armand Colin (2e éd. 1941, 6e éd. 1962)
- Toussaint, Maurice 1955. *La frontière linguistique en Lorraine*, Paris: A. et J. Picard
- Trask, L. (1997) <http://linguistlist.org/~ask-ling/archive-1997.7/msg00609.html>
- Treffers-Daller, J. and R. Willemyns eds. 2002. *Language Contact at the Romance-Germanic Language Border* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters
- Vassberg, L.M. (1993) *Alsatian Acts of Identity* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters
- Veltman, Calvin and M. N. Denis 1988. Usages linguistiques en Alsace: presentation d'une enquête et premiers résultats *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 74
- Walter, Henriette 1999. On the trail of France's regional languages. in P. Blanchet, R. Breton, et H. Schiffman eds. *The regional languages of France: An inventory on the eve of the XXIst Century*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 15-24
- Walter, Henriette 1994. *L'aventure des langues en Occident*, Robert Laffont
- Weckmann, A. 1999. *Langues d'Alsace: mode d'emploi*. Strasbourg: Lectures, Ecritures
- Wolff, Philippe 1970 *Les origines linguistiques de l'Europe occidentale*, Paris: Hachette

Primary sources

Private correspondence with

Comité des Frontaliers, 1, rue de la Paix, F-57200 Sarreguemines

Joseph F Foster, Ph D, Assoc. Professor of Anthropology Dept. of Anthropology, University of Cincinnati, Ohio, USA November 2002

Interview with Dr. Klaus Zeßner, Bürgermeister of Homburg/Saar and former Headmaster of the Staatliches Saarpfalzgymnasium Homburg, February 20 2002

Websites consulted other than hitherto mentioned

See Transcript of debate held on Thursday 21 November 2002 regarding motions for the amendment of Article Two of the French Constitution to include mention of respecting and defending regional languages. The motions were not carried.

<http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/12/cr/2002-2003/20030073.asp>

Overview of the Saar-Lor-Lux region

http://www.grande-region.lu/html_fr/saar_lor_lux/index.html

Flemish in France:

<http://www.uoc.edu/euromosaic/web/document/neerlandes/an/i1/i1.html>

Virginie André and Desirée Castillo: The 'Competent Foreigner': A new model for foreign language didactics?
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
154-162
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Virginie André, Desirée Castillo and the Editors, 2005

The 'Competent Foreigner' A new model for foreign language didactics?

Virginie André and Desirée Castillo

CRAPEL, Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues
Université Nancy 2, France
Virginie.Andre@univ-nancy2.fr, edcastillo@yahoo.com

Abstract

The traditional schema of the language learning-teaching situation is being increasingly challenged by didacticians, sociolinguists and cognitive psychologists, and in particular the constitutive roles of teacher, learner and native speaker have been largely reconfigured to take into account approaches such as learner autonomy and self-directed learning. In this article we will suggest and explain a new model for foreign language didactics: the competent foreigner. This concept emphasizes the fact that learners should be themselves instead of trying to become native speakers. We are using the concept of the competent foreigner in our ongoing research at the CRAPEL: the description and analysis of exolinguaistic service encounters.

Introduction

In this article, we will examine two aspects of foreign language didactics. First, we will look at the different participants who intervene in a typical foreign language learning situation. We will also propose that the current concept of the native speaker and the abstract model of the learner are not good reference points for the design of foreign language programmes. Second, we will propose that a better and more realistic model for language didactics be developed, that of the 'Competent Foreigner'. This concept is the result of research done at the CRAPEL. We are interested in using this concept in the description and analysis of exolinguaistic service encounters.

The scope of the research

In the research being conducted by GREFSOC (Groupe de Réflexion en Sociolinguistique)¹, we are trying to reveal the 'communicative virtues'² in encounters in the service industries in France, lead-

¹ The GREFSOC group comprises the following members: Hervé Adami, Virginie André, Sophie Bailly, Desirée Castillo, Florence Poncet and Philip Riley.

² "Communicative virtues are characteristics of discursive and communicative behaviour which are valued positively by the members of a group" (André, 2003).

ing to a better understanding of the representations/beliefs of ‘successful interaction’. The process also highlights intercultural differences, the understanding of which is a major need of our learners. We would like to use that information to prepare courses for two types of learners: French people who work in the service industry and learners of French.

Since the GREFSOC research is in its initial stages, and we cannot show final results, we will focus on the two central postulates in this article that underpin the approach to the design of the courses:

- First, the ‘native speaker’ is not an appropriate point of reference for the definition of language learning objectives, for pedagogical, sociolinguistic and ethical reasons: Instead of trying to clone native speakers, language programmes should aim to enable learners to express themselves as competent foreigners without having to sacrifice their own culture or identity.
- Second, the current approach to ‘the learner’ is in fact an abstract model of the learning process, which needs to be extended to include individual and social characteristics.

Having presented our perspective, we will now examine three different elements that play a part in language learning programmes: the learner, the native speaker and the teacher. We will review the notions of communicative, intercultural and plurilingual³ competencies, as well as GREFSOC’s research regarding exolingustic service encounters. Finally, we will propose a definition of the concept ‘competent foreigner’.

The different participants in the process of language learning

Normally, there are three different participants who, to different degrees, intervene in the process of learning a foreign language: the learner, the native speaker and the teacher.




Figure no.1

³ We wish to emphasize that we are using the French term plurilingual, as it is used in the Council of Europe, rather than the term multilingual, because the French make the following distinction: ‘plurilingual’ refers to the capacity of a person to manage more than one language. ‘Multilingual’ refers to the nature of the environment, such as a society that uses different languages, learning materials in different languages, language centres that provide access to different languages, etc.

Defining the role of the learner

Behaviourism characterised the learner as passive. In fact, the learner was considered to be only a receiver of the information provided by somebody else. After World War II, stimulated by humanistic-psychological and constructivist approaches, and based on research in acquisition and learning, new pedagogies arose. Usually called 'alternatives', they were characterized by 'learner-centredness'. Today they are known as 'autonomous learning', 'independent learning' or 'self-directed learning', and they have changed the roles of student, teacher and school.

A more active role is attributed to the 'student', whose designation also changes. The learner, the active participant in the learning process, acquires his/her knowledge instead of having it provided by someone else (Gremmo and Riley, 1995). At the same time, each learner is recognised as an individual: each has his/her own social and cultural characteristics and his/her own motivations for learning. In recognizing the individuality of the learners, the didactic movement took steps to specifically account for their objectives, their learning strategies, their representations, their past, and also the changes and development people experience while they are learning a language.

Defining the role of the native speaker and the teacher

A learner will usually have two speaking models: the native speaker and the teacher.

a. The native speaker

The native speaker is the keystone of traditional language learning: (s)he is the perfect model of how the learner must speak, and of what the learner, who can be considered as an incomplete native speaker (Byram, 1997: 11), has to become. But in the last 18 years, linguists "have started to examine critically the construct of the native speaker" (Kramsch, 1998: 20). Kramsch mentions that 'identity', 'unquestioned authority' and 'appropriateness of the one native speaker norm' (1998:16) have been criticised.

One of the critics of the native speaker model, Byram (1997: 21), suggests two flaws in the model. The first is a 'pragmatic educational' flaw: It is virtually impossible for learners to have the "same mastery over a language as an (educated) native speaker". Byram suggests that because of the tendency to compare language learners with bilinguals, who are perceived as being capable of speaking two languages perfectly, it is assumed that learners can achieve comparable mastery. But, as Byram says, the literature on bilinguals shows that even if bilinguals can be competent linguistically, they are less so socioculturally. Thus for him, they do not provide a suitable basis for comparison. The second flaw is related to the fact that learners are expected to abandon their language and culture to acquire "a native sociocultural competence, and a new sociocultural identity" (1997: 11). These expectations are according to Byram impossible.

With regard to the three areas of criticism by Kramsch mentioned above, GREFSOC explored that of 'identity'. Indeed, once we try to determine more precisely who the native speaker is, we are confronted with questions that are difficult to answer: Is he male, or is she female? How old is (s)he? Is (s)he five, fifteen, thirty? Where is (s)he from? Is (s)he from England, the United States, Australia? What does (s)he do for a living? These questions, however, cannot be answered. We realize that we cannot find any uniquely distinguishing characteristics of the native speaker.

We have to recognize that the native speaker, whose spirit haunts the world of foreign language didactics, does not correspond to reality: (S)he is an ideal, an abstraction of homogeneity, which Adami et al. describe as “the member of a Chomskian community, from whom any source of linguistic or social variation has been removed” (2003: 542). But the concept of the native speaker is paradoxical: on the one hand, teachers believe that the best person to teach a foreign language is a native speaker (some teachers even feel guilty for not being a native speaker of the foreign language they teach). On the other hand, teachers can become sceptical of the linguistic competence of real life native speakers, as the following examples from France show:

- The case of a group of secondary school teachers who expressed their satisfaction and their relief when they heard that they would not have an assistant for the year, because [they had discovered that young] native-speaker assistants do not speak correctly, have regional or (worse) urban accents, do not articulate clearly, do not form grammatically correct sentences, make other kinds of mistakes, and use a young-age vocabulary.
 - The same phenomenon occurred in the university system, where a native-speaker English lecturer found herself in an empty classroom, because the students, with the support of a number of professors, refused to attend [her class] ‘because of her poor English’.
 - A group of language teachers at a secondary school stopped a tandem email exchange [between their students and students from an Anglophone country], because the young native-speaker correspondents ‘expressed themselves poorly’.
- (Adami et al., 2003: 543)

Naturally, speaking or acting like a native speaker can be taken as proof that the learner has achieved success in his learning process. But this raises yet another question: To what degree is it possible for a learner to become a native speaker? As Piller (2002: 191) points out, for a person passing as a native speaker, it “is an act, something [(s)he does], a performance that may be put on or sustained for a limited period only”, usually within service encounters. However, Piller also describes the paradox faced by a person who has an exceptional level in the learned language and can ‘pass’ for a native speaker for long periods. In spite of her skill, the non-native speaker often indicates as early as possible in an interaction that she is not a native speaker in order to avoid embarrassment: “If I don’t [say that I’m not German], (...) some reference to something every German knows will come up, and I won’t understand, and they’ll think I’m stupid” (Piller: 195).

Thus, in contrast to the usual expectations of the native speaker in language programmes, we agree with Riley (1998: 439), who insists on a methodology “based on exolingustic discourse”, for example using materials with extracts from competent non-native discourse. This idea is supported by Piller (2002: 195), who argues that “it would help to set up more realistic goals, and support SLL [second language learning] by presenting students with realistic role models of successful L2 users rather than the monolingual native speakers they can never be”.

b. The teacher’s evolution towards ‘supervisor’

Each society seeks for a way to transmit its knowledge and its culture to its children and its new members. In Western countries, one of the main ways in which this is done is via school and more specifically via teachers. The teacher’s role is established by society, and, as Bruner explains (1996: 37): “the act of teaching is transfigured in a mold in which a teacher, presumed omniscient, says or shows to learners, who are supposedly ignorant, something that they are not supposed to know any-

thing about”⁴. Thus, the teacher is generally perceived as the source of all knowledge which (s)he will transmit to the learners.

In the educational reconfiguration that was mentioned previously (cf. the section: 'Defining the role of the learner'), the role of the language teacher has evolved into being in harmony with the more participatory role of the learner. As a result, new designations have appeared on the educational scene: 'supervisor', 'counsellor', 'tutor', 'facilitator' and 'mentor'. A supervisor, the term we use at the CRAPEL, is a person who aims not to communicate his/her academic knowledge but rather his/her didactic 'savoir-faire' to the learner so that the latter will be able to make his/her own decisions concerning his/her learning. As mentioned earlier, these decisions pertain to the choice of aims, selection of materials, evaluation, etc.

To develop in this way, the teacher/adviser needs to:

- Distinguish between the four skills (that is oral versus written comprehension and oral versus written production) and to work with them in an appropriate way.
- Understand the learning and acquisition processes in order to be able to suggest appropriate activities for a specific phase of a skill. (The different phases are discovery, practice and utilization, and each requires a different kind of activity.)
- For each skill, be aware of the strategies used by the learners in their mother tongue in order to help them use the strategies in the foreign language.
- Use authentic materials⁵ in order to put the learners in closer contact with the target language.
- Help the learners to develop compensatory strategies so they can handle a situation even though they do not have the necessary linguistic skills.

The omniscient teacher no longer has the last word in designing a 'perfect' foreign language programme based on the abstract learner and the idealized native speaker. The teacher/supervisor must know who the learners are, where they come from, why they are learning the language, where and how they are going to use it, etc. This information will help the teacher/supervisor to develop a programme *with* the learners, one which is congruent with their aims, needs, etc., based on communicative items instead of linguistic ones. Furthermore, working in an autonomous way, the importance of learners being themselves will be reinforced.

Communicative, intercultural and plurilingual competencies

The sociolinguistic work of Hymes showed that it is important “not only to see languages as part of systems of speaking but also to see systems of speaking from the standpoint of the central question of the nature of sociocultural order” (Hymes, 1972a: 70). He adds that the speaker must acquire communicative competence, by which he means knowing the rules which govern the interactions of his/her community in order to adopt a communicative behaviour adapted to the situation. Being competent implies “knowing the social and the cultural/situational rules of the interactions” (André, 2003).

⁴ Text translated by the authors.

⁵ By authentic materials we mean materials, such as TV shows, songs, etc. that were not designed specifically for instructional purposes.

Hymes' work in the fields of sociolinguistics and American anthropological linguistics (Foley, 1997) have also been a main source of reflection in the didactic world. We have inherited, among other things, the concept of 'communicative competence' (Hymes, 1972b), and we are interested in using this concept in foreign language didactics. But the notion of 'communicative competence' was not developed for exolingual communication. That is why researchers working in the field of foreign language learning and teaching have been interested in developing definitions that integrate the characteristics of learning other languages. Thus we find two other concepts related to this field: intercultural competence and plurilingual competence.

Byram proposes that 'intercultural communicative competence' is a concept which expands the concept of communicative competence (1997: 3). Teaching a foreign language involves much more than just teaching the structure of the language. It is also different from teaching the mother tongue of the learner. For Byram, learners with intercultural communicative competence are people who are

able to interact with people from another country and culture in a foreign language. They are able to negotiate a mode of communication and interaction which is satisfactory to themselves and the other and they are able to act as mediator between people of different cultural origins. Their knowledge of another culture is linked to their language competence through their ability to use language appropriately – sociolinguistic and discourse competence – and their awareness of the specific meanings, values and connotations of the language. They also have a basis for acquiring new languages and cultural understanding as a consequence of the skills they have acquired in the first. (1997: 71)

Byram emphasizes the importance of taking into account the cultural aspect while teaching and learning a foreign language. We further note that we are also confronted with the term 'plurilingual competence', which adds another dimension to the definitions of 'communicative competence' and 'intercultural communicative competence', by focusing on today's complex situations involving plurilingual contacts.

Coste, Moore and Zarate define 'plurilingual and pluricultural competence' as:

the competence to communicate linguistically and to interact culturally [which is] possessed by an actor who masters, to differing degrees, numerous languages, and has, to differing degrees, the experience of numerous cultures, all the while being able to manage the totality of this language and cultural capital. The major idea is to consider that there is no superposition or juxtaposition of distinct competencies, but rather the existence of a plural competency, complex, even composite and heterogeneous, which includes individual competencies, even partial ones, but which is a unit in terms of a repertory available for the social actor concerned. (1997: 12)

Later, Coste adds that

plurilingual competence, that is, the potential to manage a plurilingual repertory, integrates the capabilities of translation, interpretation, code switching, the transition from one language to another, [and] bilingual speaking, [in other words] all of the operations that a 'juxtaposed' conception of 'unilingual' communication capabilities barely takes into account. (2002: 118)

As can be seen, plurilingual is more than just the changing from one language to another. It relates to the fact that a person who is in contact with different languages will himself change: his/her mother tongue, cultural boundaries and identity is modified.

As already mentioned, being competent in a foreign language involves, first, knowing the social and the cultural/situational rules of interaction, and second, being able to manage a repertory of interlinguistic varieties and skills, a repertory based on what the learner believes (s)he needs to know.

Service encounters

In GREFSOC we are interested in the communicative virtues that intervene in a service encounter. In a communicative situation, speakers are not only engaged in transfer of information, but they want also to project a good image of themselves. In other words, we can use the Aristotelian notion of Ethos to describe both the intention of the speaker to give a good impression and the perception or the reception of the hearer concerning the image of his partner. According to Aristotle, ethos is defined as the author's attitude and character towards his discourse.

Ethos plays an important role today in service encounters. It has become a key element of successful communication. To make success of a 'good contact' is clearly present in any social interaction. Ethos "refers to the traits of character which a speaker has to display to an audience in order to make a good impression and thereby assure that his speech will have a successful outcome" (Riley, 2005). However, this impression can also be influenced by the values, beliefs and culture of the listener.

Service encounters follow certain social patterns. The performative value of certain statements produced during such interactions increases their sociocultural dimension. As has been seen, linguistic competence alone does not suffice for mutual comprehension between the speakers in interaction: each sociocultural group has its own norms of interaction and each exchange implies the knowledge of these various parameters. Being competent in a foreign language is to know the social and situational norms which govern interaction. Moreover, cultural variation in the conversational rules is present at all levels of verbal interaction. If a foreigner is unaware of these norms, (s)he can misinterpret the social interaction with a native speaker.

We found several examples that show how important it is to know sociocultural norms. With respect to politeness, consider the following:

- The Mexicans and the English subjects we questioned were shocked by the mechanical "bonjours" (Good morning or good afternoon) of the French cashiers and salespersons. This practice was interpreted as a usual manner of being polite but at the same time as a defence mechanism for keeping customers at a distance.
- A Venezuelan explained to us that she perceived the politeness of French as unpleasant and aggravating. Moreover, this young woman explained that she felt that the purpose of this excess of politeness was to place a distance between the administration and the customer. This feeling comes from the cultural practices of this Venezuelan who is accustomed to being close to her interlocutors. Indeed, this interpretation is related to the relaxed nature of Venezuelan service encounters.
- An Indian confided to us that, at the beginning of her stay, she was shocked by what she felt was an excessive use of 'hello', 'thank you', 'good bye' and 'good day' in stores. She ex-

plained that in India politeness is characterised by a preoccupation with being discreet. She was not aware that forms of politeness could vary from one language and culture to another.

Divergent practices for displaying politeness in service encounter interactions are a cause of tension between interactors. If the two speakers have different concepts of the relationship between customer and service provider, the interaction can be unsatisfactory for both. That is why we are interested in working with both participants in encounter services, the service providers and the foreign customers. We think that making them aware of the differences will promote more openness and tolerance.

The ‘competent foreigner’

In this section, we will focus on the French learners. As previously stated, the teacher/supervisor interested in foreign language learning and teaching needs to think about how to help learners to manage, to discover and to behave in different languages and contexts. Some researchers have expressed their interest in ethnographic approaches, because they “offer language learners an opportunity to link cultural knowledge and awareness with their own developing communicative competence” (Barro et al., 1998: 80). This approach should be applied to both cultural and linguistic aspects simultaneously, something that is not developed in most foreign language learning and teaching.

For us, being a ‘competent foreigner’ is:

- Being sensitive to the intercultural aspects, which means:
 - Becoming aware of the methodology of ethnographers (Agar 1996, Barro et al., 1998): observing, participating, experimenting, knowing how to recognize and put into practice the underlying sociolinguistic rules;
 - Mediating, “that is interpret[ing] each in terms of the other, either for themselves or for other people” (Byram, 2000), which implies a capacity to put into perspective and to ‘decenter’ his/her own culture.
- Not aiming to become a ‘native speaker’. This would mean: trying to erase his/her own identity in order to search for and adopt another.
- Being aware that ethos is intrinsic in every interaction: the image the learner thinks (s)he is transmitting can be misinterpreted?, and the learner can perceive others in a way that is different from what those others? think they are transmitting.

As has been shown, culture can result in pragmatic failure. That is why being sensitive to the features mentioned above regarding the competent foreigner allows learners to bring greater awareness to the process of learning a language and discovering and respecting the new sociocultural context. In fact, it should help learners to act with openness and tolerance.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is our contention that the native speaker is not an appropriate point of reference for a language learner and that the traditional abstract model of the learner should be modified to reflect the individual and social characteristics of each learner. By revisiting the different participants in the foreign language learning process (the teacher, the learner and the native speaker), we hope to have demonstrated the weakness in the typical method of designing foreign language programmes and to have emphasized the necessity to base those programmes more on the needs and the person-

ality (background) of each learner. We think that the notion of ethos should be included in foreign language learning and teaching programmes, which we hope we have demonstrated with the examples from the research we are carrying out at GREFSOC. Finally, we propose a new point of reference for the language learner, the competent foreigner.

To this end, we and the members of GREFSOC propose the following guidelines for the training of the competent foreigner: Learners should not be pushed to emulate a native speaker. They should be **themselves** while learning and speaking the new language, and while discovering and respecting the new sociocultural context. Instead of being trained to be only linguistically competent, they should also be trained to be culturally and socially competent, because, as research in bilingualism shows, it is in the latter domains that people experience more important difficulties.

References

- Adami H., V. André, S. Bailly, F. Carton, D. Castillo, F. Poncet & P. Riley 2003. L'étranger compétent. Un nouvel objectif pour la didactique des langues étrangères? In: D. Groux & H. Holec, eds. *Une identité plurielle. Mélanges offerts à Louis Porcher*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 535-550.
- Agar, Michael 1996. *The professional stranger. An informal introduction to Ethnography*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- André, Virginie 2003. BRASMA: Communicative virtues and service encounters in France, paper presented at the congress *The consequences of mobility: linguistic and sociocultural contact zones*, held at Roskilde University, Denmark, 23-24 May 2003.
- Barro A., S. Jordan & C. Roberts 1998. Cultural practice in everyday life: the language learner as ethnographer. In: M. Byram and M. Fleming, eds. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 76-97.
- Bruner, Jerome 1996. *L'éducation, entrée dans la culture*. Paris: RETZ.
- Byram, Michael 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, Michael 2000. Assessing intercultural competence. *Sprogforum* 18, *Intercultural competence*.
- Coste, Daniel 2002. Compétence à communiquer et compétence plurilingue. In: V. Castellotti & B. Py, eds. *La notion de compétence en langue*, Notions en questions 6:115-123.
- Coste Daniel., D. Moore & G. Zarate 1997. Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle. *Le Français dans le Monde*. Recherches et applications 8-67.
- Foley, William, 1997. *Anthropological linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Gremmo M.-J. & P. Riley 1995. Autonomy, self-direction and self access in language teaching and learning: the history of an idea. *System* 23(2):151-164.
- Hymes, Dell 1972a. Models of interaction of language and social life. In: J. Gumperz & D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics, The ethnography of communication*, Oxford: Blackwell, 35-71.
- Hymes, Dell 1972b. On communicative competence. In: J. Pride & Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 269-293.
- Kramsch, Claire 1998. The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In: M. Byram & M. Fleming, eds. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16-31.
- Marui I., Y. Mishijima, K. Noro, R. Reinelt & H. Yamashita 1996. Concepts of communicative virtues (CCV) in Japanese and German. In: Marlis Hellinger and Ulrich Ammon, *Contrastive Sociolinguistics*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Piller, Ingrid 2002. Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6(2):179-206.
- Riley, Philip 1998. Review of Michael Byram, *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. *System* 26:436-440.
- Riley, Philip 2005. Ethos and the communicative virtues in foreign language learning. In: G. Cortese & A. Duszak, eds. *Identity, Community, Discourse: English in Intercultural Settings*. Bern etc.: Peter Lang.

Maud Ciekanski: Towards the development of a plurilingual and pluricultural competence
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
163-170
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Maud Ciekanski and the Editors, 2005

Towards the development of a plurilingual and pluricultural competence

Maud Ciekanski

CRAPEL, Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues
Université Nancy 2, France
ciekansk@univ-nancy2.fr

Abstract

In 2001, the CRAPEL ran an experimental course in both English and Spanish for French-speaking adult beginners. This course, which was aimed at learners wishing to study two languages without having to follow two separate courses, was based on an integrated approach to the teaching-learning of two target languages: same communicative aims, same activities and tasks and types of materials were selected for each language, with a view to optimising the effects of learning strategies and developing plurilingual competence. First, results confirm the practical feasibility of this project as regards teaching and learning and its effectiveness in terms of outcome. However, several additional questions need to be dealt with. After presenting the didactical and pedagogical approach and its characteristics in language didactics in France, the study focuses on the language contacts and learning strategies learners develop during the experiment, as well as their repercussions for the development of such a competence.

Introduction

In 2001 the Crapel (Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues)¹ ran an experimental course in both English and Spanish for French-speaking adult beginners. The course, which was aimed at learners wishing to study two languages without having to follow two separate courses, was based on an integrated approach to the teaching-learning of two target languages. The same communicative aims, the same activities, tasks and types of materials were selected for each language. As a result, the effects of learning strategies were optimised, and the development of a plurilingual competence was defined as the capacity of a speaker to manage several communicative repertoires that vary according to circumstances.

Our experimental course lasted 88 hours. It was semi-intensive, consisting of two one-and-a-half-hour classes a week and one conversation with native speakers of the two target languages once a month. Native speakers intervene in our session as communicative partners to develop learners' oral comprehension and production. The heterogeneous group was composed of nine adult volunteers,

¹ www.univ-nancy2.fr/CRAPEL

all administrative workers at the university, who wanted to learn the two languages for personal reasons. For research purposes, all the sessions as well as the conversations with native speakers² were recorded on tape and on video tape. In addition, two series of interviews with the learners were organized. The first one took place prior to the session in order to collect their position on the co-existence of several languages in one course and on the role of integration in the learning process. The second interview took place after the session about their evaluation of the teaching-learning and their language learning. The teachers who participated in the session also interviewed the learners individually, although this may have prevented certain answers. Nevertheless, our learners knew the experimental nature of the course and considered these interviews as a contribution to improve the integrated approach. The data which we used for the paper are the learners' productions (and especially interlingual transfers and code switches), their metacognitive comments (their learning practices) recorded during the session and their opinions and attitudes about the training (their representations).

This paper presents the results of ongoing research on the effects of the integrated approach on language learning. We first describe the teaching-learning methodology. Focusing on the first analysis, we then comment on the ways in which the learners dealt with the two target languages. Finally, we suggest areas for which we feel further exploration is warranted.

From the separation between language courses to the concept of integration

The starting-point for this research project was the observation that in France, when a person needs to learn more than one foreign language at the same time, he or she has to follow and manage several courses in parallel, each course aiming at the acquisition of one language. Of course, this constraint costs time and money. But above all, we notice that the separation between the different language courses may provoke negative effects on learning, leading the learner to develop representations such as:

"Learning one language is different from learning another language"

"Transfers between languages may hamper acquisition"

"Contacts of any kind between languages should be avoided", etc.

Eventually, these representations may even make the learning of several target languages more complicated, emphasizing the fear of mixing one language with another.

This fear of mixing languages shared by a lot of learners may be generated by a certain conception of teaching-learning languages in France. First, the separation between different courses is not just a question of where and when the languages are taught (that is, in different places, at different times), but also how they are taught. Actually the very conceptions of language and methodology may vary a lot from one language teaching context to another. For example, in general, English teaching-learning is based more on language structures and on the communicative approach, whereas Spanish teaching-learning is based more on literacy in general, and literature in particular (Normand: 2002). The language approaches are different; therefore learners may not see similarities between languages and may think that one language corresponds to one way of learning it.

² The reader would find a detailed report of the experiment in Bailly et Ciekanski 2003.

Then, several studies in language classrooms reveal that interference and transfer are usually considered, by teachers and learners, as resulting from faulty acquisition of each language. Teachers usually do not encourage learners to compare one language to another nor to connect the learning of one language with that of another, as if learning English does not have anything to do with learning German or Spanish. And if sometimes teachers compare languages, it is to stress the differences much more than the similarities. In fact, the separation between languages is shown as a condition to avoid confusion and to promote easier learning and better acquisition.

Thus, the separation between languages does not only concern foreign languages but also the presence and role of the native language in teaching-learning languages. Even if the use of the native language seems to be legitimized more and more in language classrooms, according to recent official instructions³, most teachers and learners still do not consider it as a useful resource for the acquisition of another language. For them, the best way to learn a foreign language is the immersion course in which the use of the native language has to be avoided as much as possible. Consequently, code switches are also avoided as much as possible.

This short overview of the situation of language teaching-learning in France tends to show that the separation between language courses is commonly seen as positive for learning. Studies of learners of several languages reveal that L1 and L2 do play an important role in L3 acquisition⁴ (Poulisse, Bongaerts 1994; Williams, Hammerberg 1998). As regards his production, the learner has to deal with cross-linguistic influences and language switches. Thus the knowledge the learner develops in any other language may influence his learning of the new language. It may even facilitate it if this knowledge becomes a learning resource as has already been proposed by several innovative projects. For example, the Eurom4 method presents a strategy for the simultaneous learning of several Romance languages through inter-comprehension reading tasks (Blanche-Benveniste, 1997). Those experiments propose a plurilingual approach through the training of one specific skill (Debaisieux, Valli, 2003). Other experiments put the stress on the development of metalinguistic awareness as a tool for plurilingual competence (Dabène, Ingelman, 1996). Nowadays, the knowledge of two or more languages is becoming a necessity and even an economic and social key issue in our societies. Since every monolingual speaker has the potential to become multilingual, it may be time to think of didactical propositions as an alternative to the “separated model” which prevails in our training.

The integrated approach to the teaching-learning of two target languages

Following the perspectives opened by Eddy Roulet (1995) with his work on the integrated approach to the teaching-learning of the mother tongue (L1) and the second language (L2), our project aims to exploit the common properties of languages and to develop certain forms of metalinguistic reflection, so as to facilitate the learning of two target languages. Thus in our case, the integration gathers the mother tongue (L1) and two new foreign languages (two L3). According to Roulet, the integration has to concern what language is and what learning a language is. He recommends the same didactical approach for the two target languages. In our integrated approach, these conceptions are based on four primary didactical principles for the two languages, as follows:

- Give priority to communication rather than to the language structures

³ For example MENESR report 1996, concerning Spanish teaching in secondary school.

⁴ The term L1 refers to the learner’s native language, L2 to any previously learned non-native languages and L3 to the language that the learner is currently acquiring.

- Distinguish between the four skills (listening, reading, speaking and writing) and propose an appropriate way to work with them
- Implement a constructivist and a cognitivist approach through task-based learning
- Develop autonomous learning

The didactical approach

The training of the four skills requires specific tasks and types of material for each one. Thus, a document for oral comprehension does not serve for oral production (there is no point in trying to speak as a TV speaker...).

As regards oral production, in each session there are three types of activities to develop the learning process: discovery activities to observe useful linguistic forms, systematization activities to aid memorization, and practice activities to develop competences.

As regards oral comprehension, the activities aim to improve other strategies than the bottom-up model. Learners are invited to build hypotheses from the communicative situation, to check in the document and confirm or reject their first hypotheses (top-down model).

As regards cultural training, the learning objectives concern the cultural implications of communication:

- verbal and non-verbal communication usages and their variations: politeness, communicative gestures, etc..
- social facts concerning daily life (customs), cultural life (personalities, hobbies, popular culture), and the common knowledge shared by natives about history and geography.

The pedagogical approach

The integration between the two courses resides in the choice of the same communicative and learning aims.

- The **same forms and contents** are taught for the two languages: namely the same speech acts (asking for information, claiming, describing, etc.), the same communicative situations (face-to-face communication, phone conversation, TV news, etc.) and the same topics and types of material (weather report on radio, TV news about international issues, etc.). To facilitate memorization, vocabulary and language structures for each language are presented in trilingual and tricoloured documents (green for English, red for Spanish and blue for French).
- The **same activities and tasks** are proposed for the two languages. In an oral or written comprehension activity, the listening/reading objective is the same for the two languages. For example, learners have to find nouns related to food, possessive forms, etc. from two oral/written documents (one in English, one in Spanish). In speaking activities, learners also follow the same objective. For example, first they observe and compare how to compliment, to formulate excuses, to thank, etc. from methods in English and Spanish. Then systematically, in pairs, they practise how to express compliments, excuses and thanks, first in one language, and then in the other. Finally, they use either English or Spanish in conversation with native speakers. The documents used in oral comprehension are authentic. Special methods are used to improve oral production.

In this way, the teaching of Spanish and English follows almost identical patterns. As to the learners, to pass from learning English to learning Spanish means to change the linguistic context but not the learning context, since there are two target languages but only one method. In our system, they do not have to change their way of learning or their conception of language when they alternate between target languages. Moreover, selecting similar types of materials and thinking up the same tasks for the two languages create opportunities of improving their learning strategies. For example, to set the same comprehension aims for the two target languages, in an oral comprehension activity, makes the learners:

- activate the same semantic hypotheses for the two languages (for example: in an oral comprehension activity based on BBC news and TVE news: learners have to find names of countries, personalities, other expected words heard during the first bulletin and which can also be found in the second bulletin)
- activate the same cognitive operations in two different linguistic contexts (for example: making prediction about content and linguistic form, checking and confirming first hypotheses, formulating new hypotheses, etc.)

The approach encourages learners to set up bridges between the languages, insofar as it develops linguistic and learning knowledge which can be transferred from one target language to another.

In our experiment, each course was run by one teacher. The four teachers all work at the CRAPEL, that is to say they share the same didactic culture. This common culture contributes to ensuring the same learning environment for all learners.

Language contacts and learning strategies set up by learners in our experiment

In the classroom, the learners have to cope with three languages: French, English and Spanish. Contrary to general practice in France, French, the learners' native language is the privileged language for the classroom management between teachers and learners. Instructions, explanations concerning the carrying out the tasks and metalinguistic and metacognitive comments upon the learning are formulated in French. During the learning activities, French is often used to compensate for the lack of competence in the target languages.

Contacts between English and Spanish are frequent during discovery activities. Comparing the two target languages may be used by our learners as a strategy to structure the linguistic system of each target language. It is also a means to develop a metalinguistic awareness, insofar as the presence of two target languages puts a stress on the formal aspect of languages. We noticed that the learners' memorization strategies depended on their cognitive styles⁵. In a few words, we can say that in our group globalist learners are more likely to set up common rules to organize their learning of English and Spanish and to memorize at the same time the English and the Spanish forms of a term (e.g. *Sixty/sesenta*). Analytic learners may prefer to emphasize the differences between languages and to memorize languages separately, at different moments. Thus our approach tends to favour the former.

⁵ The data analysis revealed general cognitive style tendencies in the pupils' metalinguistic comments and evaluation of their language learning.

At the beginning of the class, the learners could choose the language they wanted to start with. Most of the time, the learners decided to begin with English. In the organization of our integrated approach, the first language in the activity may become a “resource language” (Coste, 2001) used to access the second language. Thus, the learners could use their English to help them to build sentences in Spanish, whereas French would have been expected because of the proximity between the two Romance languages. For example: “On dit *primero* pour dire *d’abord*. Tout à l’heure on avait *first* en anglais”.

In this example, the Spanish word *primero* is arrived at via the English word *first*, which has been encountered before, during the English activity. The semantic and formal hints found in the first linguistic context make learners able to build hypotheses for the second linguistic context.

However, the learners reacted differently to language contacts of different kinds such as code-switching, transfer, etc. For the majority of the group, language contacts meant confusion, preventing successful acquisition. As a consequence, interference between the two target languages were regarded by learners as obstacles in their acquisition process. That is why on some occasions, learners developed strategies to avoid the language contacts encouraged by the integrated approach. For example, they neglected close similarities between French and Spanish, especially during the activities for oral expression. As Matutin Sikogukira points out (1993) in his study of the transfer of cognates in L2 and L3, beginners prefer learning words with different forms in L2 and L3, in order to facilitate the appropriation of the languages. Moreover, this attitude towards similarities may be related to the fear of false friends and to the great importance the learners give to linguistic errors in communication failures. The learners also failed to exploit code-switching between the target languages as a communicative resource. During the activities of systemization, most of the learners reacted strongly against code-switching when it was used by partners in pair work.

Our conclusion concerning contacts and strategies is that one does not learn different languages in the same way, at the same pace, with the same difficulties and the same success. Our learners differed in the degree of progress made in the two languages, and most of them perceived the experiment as a failure. However, according to Daniel Coste and al. (1998) this “ordinary imbalance” seems to be part of the construction of a plurilingual competence. Some of the common representations shared by our learners about language and language learning were in conflict with the idea of integration proposed by our approach. The integrated approach did not seem to create any particular cognitive difficulties for the learners, since their production never showed any confusion between the two target languages, and since they were able to progress in both target languages with satisfactory results. The difficulties highlighted by our experiment are mostly related to learning proceedings and representations inherited from school, which are less appropriate in our context.

Towards the development of a plurilingual competence

As we saw previously, learners create a sort of trilingual repertoire, whose function is to facilitate retention and to make it possible to employ new cognitive strategies. However they seem to be reluctant to use their repertoire for communicative purposes. We can say with Simona Pekarek (1999) that using a language to compensate for gaps in another language is not natural if the interaction is predefined, mechanical and repetitive. In interactions whose main aim is language learning, there exists an implicit understanding that the appropriation of linguistic forms is more important than actual communication. In these circumstances, the use of the native language or any other language

is seen as a failure, and some of our learners even prefer to stop the interaction rather than to code-switch and try to solve the problem.

On the contrary, we think that to encourage learners to use all the linguistic resources they possess, when the context permits it, may be another communicative strategy appropriate for a plurilingual speaker. In our experiment, to allow beginners to use their native language during a conversation with native speakers contributes to a certain extent to the development of a bilingual competence, as a first step towards plurilingual competence. We observed that when beginners prevent themselves from using their native language during interaction with native speakers, after a while, the interaction loses any communicative value or purpose and instead its aim seems to be the systemization of linguistic forms encountered previously, without taking into account the reality of the situation such as the identity of the interlocutor, the nature of the communication, etc. In this context, we cannot really say that learners are learning to communicate with foreigners. Treating French as a useful resource in learners' interaction with target-language native speakers who speak French too, thus helping them to convey the message they want, permits some learners to consider code switching as a tool in solving communicative problems. Communication becomes more important than in the former situation where French was forbidden, and learners also learn how to manage two languages, depending on negotiation with the interlocutor. This may contribute to establishing a rudimentary but effective bilingual repertoire. Another solution would be to organize conversations with a competent speaker of English and Spanish so as to permit learners to improve their practice of code-switching.

Our conclusion is that when the interaction is not only a learning situation but also a communicative situation, the will to communicate legitimizes the use of another code, and code-switching is no longer seen as a failure but as a useful resource. In this case the cooperation of the native speaker is of the utmost importance. The native speaker is often chosen by the institution for his ability to speak his native language. To a certain extent, he embodies the linguistic norm aimed at. That is why he may be reluctant to speak the learner's language. However, in a plurilingual perspective, it seems very important to us to consider the native speaker as a plurilingual speaker as well, insofar as all the native speakers who participated in our experiment live in France and speak French. They all have to manage a plurilingual and pluricultural capital, to use Bourdieu's terms. That is why they can be interesting models for communicative strategies, and especially as regards code-switching.

However native speakers also have a common representation of their role in exolingual communication⁶. Most of the time, they see their interlocutor primarily as a person who is learning a language. So, they put the stress on the correction of linguistic forms and consider the interaction as an opportunity to practice language. Obviously, learners want to communicate with a native speaker to improve their linguistic competence. But in our plurilingual perspective, it would also have been useful to consider the learner as someone who has to learn how to interact in exolingual communication to become a competent foreigner. For us, this implies rethinking the didactic contract which underlies the interaction between native speakers and learners. It also implies sensitizing the learners to the intercultural dimension of any exolingual communication. Our experiment offers learners possibilities for drawing intercultural comparisons between members of different communities and perceiving themselves as mediators between several cultures. This will form part of our future investigations.

⁶ Exolingual communication: interactions where one of the participants is a foreigner.

Conclusion

The data presented in the paper are from the very first experimental course. Several things should definitely be improved such as the pedagogical approach to code-switching. However, this experiment has shown that the integrated approach can be an alternative in the development of a plurilingual competence. Conceiving the project, we paid special attention to learning strategies and their cognitive implications. Further investigations, particularly into the intercultural aspects, could be considered, in promoting the development of a complete plurilingual and pluricultural competence.

References

- Bailly, S. et M. Ciekanski 2003. Enseigner et apprendre deux langues étrangères en un seul cours. *Vers une compétence plurilingue. Le Français dans le Monde*: 136-143
- Blanche-Benveniste, C. et al. 1997. *Eurom4. Méthode d'enseignement simultané des langues romanes*. Scandicci (Firenze): la Nuova Italia Editrice
- Coste, D., D. Moore, et G. Zarate 1998. Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle. *Apprentissage et usage des langues dans le cadre européen. Le Français dans le Monde*: 8-67
- Coste, D. 2001. De plus d'une langue à l'autre à d'autres encore. Penser les compétences plurilingues? In: V. Castelloti, *D'une langue à d'autres, pratiques et représentations, "DYALANG"*, Presses Universitaires de Rouen, 191-202
- Dabène, L., et C. Ingelman 1996. Un multilinguisme en construction: l'éveil de la conscience métalinguistique. *Le Bilinguisme, AILE* 7:123-138
- Debaisieux, J.M. et A. Valli 2003. Lectures en langues romanes. *Vers une compétence plurilingue. Le Français dans le Monde*, 143-154
- Normand, C. 2002. Quelle intégration institutionnelle des nouveaux supports: le cas du cours d'espagnol. Communication au colloque international *Pluralité des langues et des supports dans la construction et la transmission des connaissances*, Lyon, 13-14-15 juin 2002
- Pekarek, S. 1999. Stratégies de communication bilingues en classe de L2? Enjeux acquisitionnels et enjeux communicatifs. *La personne bilingue. AILE, numéro special* 127-143
- Poullisse, N. and T. Bongaerts 1994. First language use in second language production. *Applied Linguistics* 15(1):38-57
- Roulet, E. 1995. Peut-on intégrer l'Enseignement-Apprentissage décalé de plusieurs langues étrangères? In: D. Coste et D. Lehman, *Langues et curriculum, contenus, programmes et parcours, ELA* 98:113-118
- Sikogukira, M. 1993. Influence of languages other than L1 on a foreign language: a case of transfer from L2 to L3. *Edinburgh Working Paper in Applied Linguistics* 4:110-132
- Williams, S. and B. Hammarberg 1998. Language switches in L3 Production: implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics* 19(3):295-333

Ulla Lundgren: Intercultural understanding in teaching and learning English: An opportunity for Swedish compulsory education
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
171-184
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Ulla Lundgren and the Editors, 2005

Intercultural understanding in teaching and learning English An opportunity for Swedish compulsory education¹

Ulla Lundgren

*School of Education and Communication, Jönköping University, Sweden
ulla.lundgren@hik.hj.se*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the prospects of developing intercultural understanding through English as a foreign language (EFL) in the Swedish comprehensive school. The study draws on perspectives applied to culture theory (Street, Hannerz, Thavenius, Sjögren), current theories about language and culture (Kramsch, Byram, Risager), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough) and curriculum theory (Svingby, Englund). The intercultural dimension of EFL is analysed as an order of discourse with competing discourses: research discourse, education authority discourse and language teacher discourse. The findings are summarized as two categories: opportunities and obstacles for developing intercultural understanding in EFL education. Finally the three discourses are related to each other and a model is presented showing a space for the interpretation of teaching and learning in EFL.

Introduction

As education at school is part of its historic, geographic and social context, this study is geopolitically limited to a contemporary Swedish perspective. The setting is English as a foreign language (EFL) as taught to 13-16-year-olds in compulsory schooling. There are of course other perspectives from which the subject of the thesis could be viewed.

My own view is that of a former language teacher (English, Swedish and Swedish as a second language) and present teacher educator. Since I qualified as a teacher, radical changes have occurred affecting the role of language teaching: among others the major increase of internationalisation, a constructive approach to learning and a holistic view of education. Thus Sweden is no longer a rather isolated state populated by Swedes, knowledge is not seen as a matter of transferring fixed neutral messages and language teachers are very much responsible for fostering basic values. There is a growing interest in curriculum issues connected to language education to develop solidarity, cultural awareness and autonomy (Tornberg, 1996). Function and contents have been highlighted as a result of a communicative approach.

¹ The article is the English summary of Lundgren, U. (2002) Interkulturell förståelse i engelskundervisning – en möjlighet. Doctoral dissertation Lund University, Department of Education and Psychological Research, MAH (302 p) pp 264-278. Also <http://www.lub.lu.se/luft/diss/fulltextall.html>

The English language is taught from the age of seven or nine up to 19 as a compulsory subject. Media, business and tourism have given English a high status and a position which is almost that of a second language for a considerable part of the population. It is considered a necessary tool for international contacts and higher education. Though its influence is challenged by a small group of purists, English holds the unquestioned position of *lingua franca* (ELF). In EFL education there is a cultural dimension which is traditionally focused on Britain and the USA. If English is taught as a tool for international and intercultural communication there is a need for a new approach to the cultural dimension, that corresponds better to the current role of EFL. How is this intercultural dimension approached in research, in curricular documents and among language teachers?

Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to examine the prospects of developing intercultural understanding through English as a foreign language (EFL) in the Swedish comprehensive school. This overall aim is split into two subordinate aims:

- to analyse and problematize the intercultural dimension of EFL as three discourses: research discourse, authority discourse and teacher discourse
- to relate the above discourses to each other in order to reveal a space for the interpretation of teaching and learning culture in EFL.

To be able to fulfil this task a further aim will be formulated later for an interview study of teachers of English.

It is obvious that only a selection of research, curricular documents and language teachers has been included. There are of course other discourses about language and culture, *inter alia* those of parents, students, textbook writers, teacher educators. Thus only a limited number of possible discourses have been researched. As I have surveyed research and national guidelines elsewhere (Lundgren, 2001), the thesis has its main focus on teacher discourse.

Theoretical framework

One purpose of research is to show alternative views, to question what is taken for granted. The researcher's task is a pragmatic one, to take part in the construction of values, not to uncover or dig up hidden facts. It is "a search not for truth but for any usefulness that the researcher's 'reading' of a phenomenon might have in bringing about change for those who need it" (Burr, 1995, p. 162). A school subject is mediated through the teacher. I argue that students have the right to be shown different educational perspectives. So have future teachers, parents, textbook writers and others.

The thesis is set in a broad social constructionist frame. I draw on the following theoretical perspectives applied to certain key concepts of the thesis:

The concept of *culture* is interpreted as an "active construction of meaning" (Street, 1993, p.23). In an age of internationalisation we can talk about cultural complexity (Hannerz, 1992). Culture is unstable, changeable and temporary (Thavenius, 1999). Sjögren (2001) sees culture as an analytic tool being replaced by identity, related to an increasing group of post-national young people in Sweden. Street, Hannerz, Thavenius and Sjögren highlight theoretical assumptions about culture,

which give practical implications for language teachers. Ethnicity, gender, class, age and other variables surpass nation as the main concept to classify otherness.

Intercultural understanding is interpreted as a general ability to understand otherness and to be aware of one's own values. I avoid using intercultural competence, as competence to me gives connotations to technical skills. Intercultural competence is often used as a tool for power and control (Risager, 2000).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 1992) supplies the theoretical and methodological base for the thesis. In Fairclough's model for analysis the concepts text, discursive practice (production and distribution of the text) and social practice (context) form an integrated unit, a discourse. Teaching and learning culture in EFL is an area, or order of discourse, where different discourses compete about the "true" interpretation. The outcome of such a competition, or hegemonic struggle, either changes or reproduces the power relations within the order of discourse. Fairclough has been chosen for three reasons: firstly he regards research as empowerment and intervention, secondly Fairclough believes that language constitutes practice and vice versa, and thirdly CDA offers a methodological solution all in one, i.e. it is both a theory and a method.

Curriculum theory, (Svingby, 1978; Englund, 1995, 1997) is used supplementary to CDA, with respect to social practice. Svingby's frame factor influenced model for analysis has inspired the analysis of the social practice of the teacher discourse. Englund's concept, space for interpretation, supports Fairclough's theory of hegemony. Englund's tradition researches the contents of education e.g. in curricular documents and in teachers' texts (written or oral). The text offers discursive meanings which result in different pedagogical practice. Education and its contents are seen as a tension between forces. The final power is held by the state but it is a struggle fought at all levels. Education as transfer of ideologies is constantly changing due to power relations (Englund, 1995).

An overall model for analysis of the text of three discourses

Despite certain internal differences in each of the three constructed discourses, they have been summarized in terms of five thematic aspects. The five themes are inspired by among others Murphy (1988), Delanoy (1996) and Morgan (1998) who contrast traditional cultural studies to recent intercultural learning. These five components are used when analysing the three discourses of the thesis:

1. What is the aim of EFL education? (Norm for language teaching/learning.)
2. To what extent is teaching language and teaching culture considered a unit? (Integration within EFL education and cross-curricular work.)
3. How is culture described? (Interpretation of the concept of culture.)
4. What is the role of EFL in a general educational context in the comprehensive school? (Language teaching/learning related to general educational objectives.)
5. What should the student learn? (View of knowledge.)

Research discourse

The research discourse is mainly based on three researchers: Claire Kramsch, Mike Byram and Karen Risager. They all explicitly acknowledge *the intercultural speaker* (IS) as the norm for for-

eign language teaching and learning instead of *the native norm* (NS). An IS “has a capacity to discover and relate to new people from other contexts for which they have not been prepared directly” (Byram & Fleming, 1998, p. 9).

Byram’s theory of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) (Byram, 1997) dominates the investigated research discourse as it is the most practice oriented and the most developed. Byram builds on van Ek’s (1986) concepts which he redefines. ICC includes four competences: linguistic, sociolinguistic, discursive and intercultural (IC). IC is regarded as five *savoirs* (components of knowledge): Attitudes, knowledge of self and other, skills to interpret and relate, skills to discover and/or interact and critical cultural awareness. Byram argues that “all language teaching should promote a position, which acknowledges respect for human dignity and equality of human rights as the democratic basis for social interaction” (Byram, Nichols & Stevens, 2001, p.7).

1. Norm for foreign language education (FLE)	The intercultural speaker (IS) is the explicit norm.
Consequences	IS is a prerequisite for intercultural communicative competence. The native speaker norm is no longer valid.
2. Integration	Language and culture is studied in integration. Language studies are cross-disciplinary and cross-curricular.
Consequences	Linguistics and social studies meet; fruitful symbiosis or guarding of academic territory?
3. Culture	An anthropological view. Culture is a construction. Nationality is only one part of an individual’s identity.
Consequences	Knowledge <i>in</i> culture; FLT/L is extended; new cross disciplinary attitudes and competences will be demanded for teachers in schools and universities.
4. FLE as part of general educational aims	Culture learning in FLE acquires a critical dimension. Democracy issues are linked to it. An important aim for the student is to reflect upon own values.
Consequences	Language teachers in schools and universities need deeper knowledge of social science theories and cultural theories.
5. View of knowledge	A learner focused view. Knowledge is subjective and is individually constructed. Intercultural understanding is a process between individuals.
Consequences	Need for experiential learning. Qualitative assessment criteria necessary.

Table 1. The text of research discourse

Authority discourse

The Swedish National Curriculum (Skolverket, 1994) draws on international agreements, conventions and recommendations with UNESCO, Council of Europe, European Union of *human rights*, *European citizenship education* and *international understanding*. At the beginning of the 1980’s the Council of Europe recommended its member states to introduce an intercultural approach to all

education. Sweden made this recommendation a parliamentary law in 1985. As a result an international perspective in all school subjects was introduced in the national curriculum in 1994 with reference to increased internationalisation. An international perspective aiming at intercultural understanding is a basic idea of all non-statutory documents and the national curriculum. They highlight key concepts like *democracy, solidarity, attitudes, identity formation, human rights, peace education*. There is an obvious kinship between the overall perspective for a common value base in the national curriculum and the above research discourse.

However the syllabuses for foreign language education and national tests of EFL express a competing discourse. The text level of that discourse is summarized below as an authority discourse. The revised syllabus of EFL from 2000 differs from the one four years earlier in the following way:

- Intercultural understanding is more strongly stressed.
- The concept of intercultural competence is introduced.
- The perspective is broadened from English-speaking countries to an increasing English speaking environment.
- The student's ability to "develop intercultural understanding" shall be assessed.
- Intercultural competence is integrated in a "comprehensive communicative competence".
- The need for a progression from beginners to the end of upper secondary education is explicitly pronounced.

These are certainly new signals. The problem is however that all these directions (which by no means stand out as clear as in the above list) are left to the individual school to interpret and transform into actual classroom work via a local plan. So far there are no directions and no help for teachers how to do this. There are no theories referred to, no discussion of alternative curricular emphases and no methodological suggestions.

The text of an educational authority discourse (based on the syllabus of EFL) is summarized as table 2:

1. Norm for FLE	Implicit native speaker norm. The difference between norms is not problematized.
Consequences	Earlier discourse of culture in FLT reproduced.
2. Integration	Language and culture are studied within the borders of a school subject.
Consequences	The present construction of FL at school counteracts a cross-disciplinary approach and integrated work at school; Objectives of national syllabuses focus on traditional skills.
3. Culture	Culture is connected to nation, to English speaking countries. The concept of culture is not questioned.
Consequences	Culture is implicitly regarded as static and homogenous. This signals to teachers that the priority is knowledge <i>about</i> culture, culture is cognitive factual knowledge.
4. FLE as part of general educational aims	The connection is indistinct between overall aims and objectives of NC and the same of the syllabus of EFL.
Consequences	The link to democracy issues disappears in attainment targets and assessment criteria.
5. View of knowledge	Prescribed self reflection only refers to language acquisition, not to intercultural learning. Intercultural competence is not defined, but shall be assessed without guiding criteria. Attainment targets concerning culture refer to factual knowledge.
Consequences	Developing intercultural understanding and intercultural competence becomes synonymous with traditional cultural studies (re-alia). Assessment is removed.

Table 2. The text of educational authority discourse

Teacher discourse

Background

It is shown by some previous studies in other countries of language teachers' perceptions of the intercultural dimension of foreign language education (Byram & Risager, 1999; Sercu, 1999; Lázár, 2000, 2001, Guilherme, 2002) that

- The role of English as a lingua franca is stressed but "culture" is connected to nation.
- The concept of culture is not problematized.
- A critical approach to teaching culture is non-existent.
- The demand for quantitative assessment of students guide language teaching towards measurable products.

No national studies have yet been published researching teachers' perceptions. My aim is to answer the research question: Which prospects to develop intercultural understanding are evident in a teacher discourse? This overall question is answered after researching two subordinate questions:

(a) How can the practical theories of some teachers be exemplified? (b) How does the social practice of a teacher discourse appear as obstacles and opportunities for teaching?

Method and design

The research interview as a tool for constructing knowledge (Kvale, 1996) implies that there is no fixed meaning but a creative interaction between two active parts. The interview is a continuous process of meaning. During the interviews I kept turning back all the time asking questions like: “You said at the beginning of our talk that ... how does that agree with what you are just saying” etc. I also asked some of the informants to recapitulate our conversation, to sum up etc. Still I am aware that what is said is merely what is said, what the teacher thinks can never fully be recorded.

Ten qualified and very experienced teachers of English (teaching the ages of 13-16) were individually interviewed twice, first face-to-face (for 45-60 minutes) and six months later by telephone (for 20-30 min.). All interviews were recorded and fully transcribed. After the first occasion the informants were sent “their” text and asked to comment upon and clarify certain issues (respondent validation).

The interviews followed an open interview guide. I tried however to cover the following aspects:

1. How does the teacher relate to the intercultural dimension of EFL?
 - (a) What, according to the teacher, is the meaning of “intercultural understanding”?
 - (b) What, according to the teacher, does she want the student to understand and why?
 - (c) What does the teacher tell about her own practice to help create this understanding?
2. Which obstacles and opportunities for EFL education with an intercultural perspective are expressed by the teacher?

The interviews are presented in three ways:

- Four extensive “portraits” are recorded showing different personal practical theories. They illustrate question 1 above. Comments are made on each of them, using language and culture theories from the research discourse.
- The accounts of all ten teachers are related to the same overall analysis model (using the five themes) used for the three discourses.
- The social practice of teacher discourse generated as a result from the interviews covering (a) collective social practice (Fairclough): society and central guidance through national syllabuses (macrocontext); (b) individual social practice: the local school environment (microcontext).

Findings of the analysis of teacher discourse

All teachers say that intercultural understanding is important, but very few see it as an explicit task for the foreign language teacher. Very few comments are made about societal changes and central guidelines (macrocontext) as reasons for an intercultural approach to teaching and learning English. The guiding text that the teachers refer to is the national assessment. The fact that it does not assess intercultural understanding sets the norm for what counts as important and valuable knowledge. This applies even to teachers, who account for a personal commitment to citizenship education, solidarity, tolerance etc.

Obstacles to teaching English from an intercultural perspective dominating the interviews could be found in the teachers' microcontext. All except one refer to factors outside themselves. Only one teacher discusses her own part in the missing perspective: "I have not really got down to thinking about it". The obstacles for the teachers according to the interviews could be characterised as follows:

- A traditional view of cultural studies is still prevalent; there is no discussion about the issue of intercultural understanding.
- Everyday school practice is hectic and full of practical problems to solve; they are constantly overworked.
- Language acquisition assessment criteria set the agenda for their teaching.
- There is no time for self-reflection or reflection with other teachers.
- Knowledge about methods is lacking; no one refers to the need for theories.
- The students are not interested in the intercultural dimension of EFL.
- Teachers mention four qualities that are essential to developing the students' intercultural understanding:
 - Students must be able to feel empathy. They have a tendency to polarize, they are prejudiced, narrow-minded and egoistic.
 - Students must be mature. Not until upper secondary level is it possible for them to take the position of the other.
 - Students must have acquired a high level of language proficiency.
 - Students must learn to understand that there are alternatives to factual knowledge. They are trained to give priority to memorizing facts.

In consequence some teachers regard the students' lack of intercultural understanding as a negative basis for developing intercultural understanding. To me it seems a Catch 22 situation. The teachers, who tell about successful intercultural teaching, (1) see their students as curious about otherness and the world outside themselves and, (2) are prepared to let the students use their mother tongue in discussions when their English is not sufficient and (3) require from them personal reflections and value their ability to argue for a standpoint. But even those teachers do not assess the students' intercultural understanding. The text of the teacher discourse (interviews) is summarized as table 3:

1. Norm for FLE	Implicit native speaker norm. The difference between norms is not problematized.
Consequences	Earlier discourse of culture in FLT can implicitly be reproduced.
2. Integration	Polarized conceptions: the majority express a focused view of school subjects; one teacher explicitly expresses cross-curricular preferences. The need for integrating communicative competence and intercultural competence is only expressed by one teacher.
Consequences	The present construction of FL at school counteracts a cross-disciplinary approach and integrated work at school; Objectives of national syllabuses focus on traditional skills.
3. Culture	Culture is connected to nation, to English speaking countries by all but one teacher. The concept of culture is not questioned. Culture is “how other people live and think”. Factual knowledge is part of the teaching but the teachers want their pupils to “understand that there are alternative ways of thinking to ours”. Some talk about readiness for a multicultural society. Two teachers talk about ethnic minority students as a resource for the language classroom.
Consequences	Culture is implicitly regarded as static and homogenous; This fact signals to students that priority knowledge is <i>about</i> culture, culture is mainly regarded as cognitive factual knowledge.
4. FLE as part of general educational aims	Two teachers represent polarized views. The others take up positions between.
Consequences	Focused subject oriented perspective versus holistic view.
5. View of knowledge	An implicit learner centered and constructivist view. On a general level the learner shall be educated to live in an internationalized society. Only one teacher discusses the implications for the language teacher role.
Consequences	Cultural awareness etc. is not the responsibility of language teachers. Cultural dimension is reproduced.

Table 3. The text of teacher discourse

Discussion

I see the present order of discourse as a result of power relations. The governmental officials, who are in charge of the national guidelines for foreign languages, rely to a great extent on former language teachers and reproduce a former discourse for culture in current EFL. The syllabus is not up-to-date with current research, but adhere to it in so far as it uses certain concepts (intercultural competence, intercultural communicative competence, intercultural understanding) referring to the *Common European Framework* (Council of Europe, 1998/2001) and emphasise the need for assessment and progression of intercultural understanding. Teachers are powerful as they are in charge of contents and actual classroom pedagogy. If official guidelines are vague and contradictory

it is safe to stick to earlier practice. The possibility of making an independent local interpretation in a local plan for teaching EFL is not used by the teachers. The teacher discourse is reproduced.

The third discourse, research, has little power. Research is general, abstract and, concerning the intercultural dimension, very little introduced in Sweden.

Conclusion

The relations between the three discourses investigated and the consequences of the relationship have been summarized above. The aim of this thesis has been to examine the prospects for developing intercultural understanding through English as a foreign language (EFL) in the Swedish comprehensive school. By analysing and problematizing three discourses, research discourse, authority discourse and teacher discourse, the conclusion is summarized as opportunities that promote, versus obstacles that prevent, education for intercultural understanding in ELF teaching.

Opportunities that promote educating for intercultural understanding

- There is a developed theoretical base available (Byram, Kramsch, Risager and others). The researchers explicitly build onto the norm of the intercultural speaker. The theories are in full agreement with the overall educational perspective for the Swedish school, the common value base.
- International non-statutory agreements and the national curriculum prescribe that understanding of otherness shall be visible in actual practice across the curriculum.
- The national syllabuses for all foreign language education have introduced the concepts intercultural understanding and intercultural competence. The official commentary supplement uses the concept intercultural communicative competence.
- Intercultural understanding shall be assessed.
- The fundamental attitude of the interviewed teachers is: It is important to develop students' understanding of otherness and self.
- An increasing number of multicultural students in Swedish schools can contribute to alternative perspectives.

Obstacles that prevent education for intercultural understanding

- Current research does not reach teachers.
- The national syllabus is not anchored in theory; it contradicts international and national overall educational aims; the text narrows the perspective towards factual knowledge, its concepts are vague and assessment criteria.
- National tests do not assess intercultural understanding, teachers are guided by quantitative criteria, language proficiency dominates teaching.
- Secondary school organisation, focused on specific subjects (e.g. ELT) as taught by language specialists, obstructs cross-curricular thematic education.
- Teachers lack time and supervision for didactic reflection and development, which leads to an uncritical attitude to new concepts in central guidelines; traditional culture studies dominate.
- External circumstances in a local microcontext are classified as main obstructions.
- There are teachers who see students' lack of ability to take the perspective of the other as a major obstacle.

The prospects for developing intercultural understanding in EFL will change if hegemonic power and dominance within the order of discourse of the intercultural dimension is changed.

Finally the above discourses are summarized and related to each other in order to show a space for the interpretation of teaching and learning culture in EFL (table 4):

NORM FOR TEACHING/LEARNING ENGLISH	
English is studied as a national language	English is studied as a tool for international contacts
The student shall * achieve a near native cultural competence * get to know an Anglo Saxon cultural heritage	The student shall * act as a mediator between cultures * learn to question his/her own views * value alternative perspectives
Ideal: native speaker	Ideal: intercultural speaker
VIEW OF INTEGRATING LANGUAGE AND CULTURE AND VIEW OF CROSS -CURRICULAR WORK	
Focus on the subject Distinct boundaries between school subjects and different parts of the subject	Focus on social education Cross-curricular work Integration within the subject FLT/L is part of NC international perspective, overriding curricular aims and guidelines
A focused view of school subjects	A holistic view of everything that goes on at school
PERCEPTION OF CULTURE	
Culture as essence Culture as a homogenous concept.	Culture as a signifying process - an active construction of meaning Culture is continuously changing
Culture as products	Culture as process
VIEW OF KNOWLEDGE	
Fact-based learning encouraged Teacher - centered Objective Transmission Reproduction	Affective, experiential learning encouraged Student-centered Subjective Knowledge as a social construction
Knowledge about a homogenous "majority culture"	Readiness for a heterogeneous multicultural existence now and in the future
AIM OF CULTURE STUDIES	
Give maximal chances in a competitive international job market	Offer personal development towards active global citizenship Increase critical cultural awareness Develop a deepened solidarity Discover and repudiate ethnocentrism Cultural learning is part of general citizenship education
Instrumental and rational motive	Democratic motive

Table 4. Space of interpretation for the intercultural dimension of EFL

Epilogue

It is a moral and ethical question to me to fully use the opportunities for citizenship education in teaching English as a foreign language in compulsory schooling in Sweden. Thus it is natural to criticize my study for being normative. The researcher's own discourse is vital in the analysis. As there is no objective research but merely discursive constructions, I am fully aware that with another investigator the results would be different. The aim of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is to question "truths" that are taken for granted. The concept of intercultural understanding has been highlighted as a "floating significant" within an order of discourse where a hegemonic struggle is being fought. My task has been to problematize "the battlefield" and question its concepts. The thesis has tried to turn something apparently objective into something political. What is implicitly taken for granted has been highlighted as something which one can be for or against (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000, s. 151). This has been done with the purpose of stimulating the debate about the aim of the intercultural dimension of EFLT/L in Swedish foreign language education.

Finally the thesis suggests ways of increasing positive prospects. A more constructive dialogue between different discourses would create new opportunities for developing intercultural understanding. I point to the vital role of teacher education in bridging the gaps between research, educational authorities and language teachers. Teacher education is also a powerful discourse, which I hope to be able to research now that my present work is finished.

References²

- Burr, V. 1995. *An introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge
- Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters
- Byram, M. & Fleming, M, Eds. 1998. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Byram, M. & Risager, K. 1999. *Language Teachers, Politics and Cultures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Byram, M., Nichols, A. & Stevens, D., Eds. 2001. *Developing Intercultural Competence in Practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Council of Europe, 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Delanoy, W. 1996. Cultural learning in the foreign language classroom: from 'Landeskunde' to 'New Cultural Studies'. www.britcoun.org/studies/stdsinds.htm
- Englund, T. 1995. På väg mot undervisning som det ordnade samtalet. In: G. Berg, T. Englund & S. Lindblad, Red. *Kunskap - organisation - demokrati. Vänbok till Erik Wallin*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Englund, T. 1997. Undervisning som meningserbjudande. In: M. Uljens, Red. *Didaktik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity
- Guilherme, M. 2002. *Critical Citizens for an Intercultural World. 'Foreign Language Education as Cultural Politics'*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Hannerz, U. 1992. *Cultural complexity: studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Kramsch, C. 1993. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kramsch, C. 1998. The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In: M. Byram & M. Fleming, Eds. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kvale, S. 1996. *InterViews: an introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Lázár, I. 2000. English teachers' perceptions of the role of culture in language teaching: a qualitative study. Unpublished paper. Language Pedagogy Ph.D. Program, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
- Lázár, I. 2001. Culture-related activities in the language class-room: an inter-cultural study. Unpublished paper. Language Pedagogy Ph.D. Program, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
- Lundgren, U. 2001. *Att utbilda för interkulturell förståelse. En studie av styrande texter för grundskolans engelskundervisning*. Institutionen för pedagogik. Malmö Högskola, Pedagogisk- Psykologiska problem Nr 670

² Includes only literature mentioned in the summary of the thesis.

- Morgan, C. 1998. Cross-cultural encounters. In: M. Byram & M. Fleming, Eds. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Murphy, E. 1988. The cultural dimension in foreign language teaching: Four models. *Language, culture and curriculum* 1(2):147-163
- Risager, K. 1998. Language teaching and the process of European integration. In: M. Byram & M. Fleming, Eds. *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Risager, K. 2000. Læreren interkulturelle kompetence. *Sprogforum*, 18(6):14–20
- Risager, K. 2004. Det nationale dilemma i sprog- og kulturpædagogikken. Et studie i forholdet mellem sprog og kultur. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag
- Sercu, L. 1999. Interculturalising foreign language teachers' thinking. A comparative analysis of English, French and German teachers' professional self-concepts. Paper presented on 16 December 1999 at 'Colloque international: Xénophilie/xénophobie et diffusions des langues. Xenophilia/xenophobia and propagation of languages, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Fontenay/ Saint-Cloud, Paris, France'. To be published in G. Zarate (ed.) Proceedings
- Sjögren, A. 2001. Interkulturell pedagogik med etnologisk inriktning I. Skola och utbildning ur ett etnologiskt perspektiv. In: G. Bredänge m.fl., Red. *Utbildning i det mångkulturella samhället. Volym 2*. Symposium 19-20 juni, Göteborgs universitet
- Skolverket, 1994. Curriculum for the compulsory school, the pre-school class and the after school center. <http://www.skolverket.se/english/publ.shtml>
- Street, B. 1993. Culture is a verb. In: D. Graddol, L. Thompson & M. Byram, Eds. *Language and Culture*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Svingby, G. 1978. *Läroplaner som styrmedel för svensk obligatorisk skola: teoretisk analys och ett empiriskt bidrag*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis
- Thavenius, J. 1999. De många kulturbegreppen. In: L. G. Andersson, M. Persson & J. Thavenius, *Skolan och de kulturella förändringarna*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Tornberg, U. 1996. Språkdidaktik. *Didactica minima* 36. Stockholm: HLS förlag
- Winther Jørgensen, M. och L. Phillips 2000. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Karen Risager: *Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching*
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
185-196
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Karen Risager and the Editors, 2005

Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching

Karen Risager

Department of Language and Culture, University of Roskilde, Denmark
risager@ruc.dk

Abstract

Are language and culture inseparable, or are they separable? Neither of these positions is tenable, and in order to find a solution to this seeming paradox, it is useful to develop a theoretical understanding of the concept of languaculture. The point of departure should be a sociolinguistic one, seeing language primarily as linguistic practice going on in - small and large - social networks of various ranges, incl. the global range. Languages, i.e. language users, spread all over the world by various kinds of migration, and each language carries languaculture with it. The languaculture of each specific language is seen as encompassing three interrelated dimensions: a semantic and pragmatic potential, a poetic potential and an identity potential. Languages and their languacultures spread across cultural contexts and discourse communities. This view has a range of far-reaching implications for the content and identity of language teaching and learning.

Introduction

The relationship between language and culture may be viewed from two opposite angles: On the one hand language may be seen as closely associated with a culture: language and culture are seen as inseparable phenomena. On the other hand language may be seen as an instrument of communication that may be used with any subject and anywhere in the world: language and culture are seen as separated phenomena. The teaching of English as an international language is often accompanied by the second view.

None of these positions is satisfying. The first one emphasises that language is culture-bound, and one is not far from a conception of a closed universe of language, culture, history and mentality - a national romanticism that is misleading in the light of international and transnational processes in the (late-)modern world. The other one claims that language is culturally neutral; language is seen as a code, and one is not far from a reconstitution of the classical structuralist conception of the autonomy of language.

Language should be conceptualised as an integrated part of society, culture and the psyche. Language is always cultural in some respects. But how can we construct a model of the relationship between language and culture that does not lock language into a national romantic universe, and at the same time does not claim that language is culturally neutral?

I consider the concept of languaculture as very useful in the construction of a such a new understanding of the relationship between language, culture and society in a globalising world. Languaculture may be a key concept in the understanding of language as both a social and a cultural phenomenon. In what follows I will elaborate on this issue, dealing firstly with a view of language as a social phenomenon seen in a global perspective, secondly with a view of language as a cultural, i.e. meaning-making, phenomenon, and thirdly with some implications for foreign and second language studies¹ (for a more comprehensive analysis, see Risager 2003 and Risager forthcoming b).

A social view of language

The teaching and learning of languages since the 1970s has been influenced by the pragmatic turn in linguistics. Today it is common to state that language use should be analysed in relation to the context of communication, and that language teaching and learning should focus on the appropriate use of the target language, oral and written, according to situational and wider social contexts. This communicative approach is often characterized as sociolinguistic as it rests upon a concept of language that foregrounds language as a means of communication in social interaction. However, although I recognize the importance of a communicative approach, I want to develop a more dynamic view of language in a global perspective.

In doing so, I refer to the concept of social network, which is widely used in the social sciences (for instance Hannerz 1992). Social network theory makes it possible to examine social relations and chains of social interaction at various levels of social practice, from the micro-level of interpersonal interaction to macro-levels of mass-communication and communication between organisations and other collective actors.

As regards language, one may study how a specific (national) language is used and how it spreads in social networks of various ranges. The French language, for example, is used in many kinds of social networks at various levels in francophone countries. But it is also used in other places in the world. In fact French may be seen as a world language in the sense that speakers of French live in practically every country and region in the world - as tourists, students, business people, diplomats, doctors, journalists, scientists etc. etc. So languages such as French (i.e. people using French) spread all over the world, across cultural contexts and discourse communities. This mobility (which is by no means accessible for all) is made possible by modern technologies of transportation.

Connections between people all over the world in patterns of social networks are made possible by the means of telecommunication and the world wide web. For instance, I can correspond by e-mail in French with a colleague in Australia; I can read on-line newspapers produced in the German-speaking community in Argentina; I can talk in Danish by mobile phone to a relative of mine who is travelling in Poland. We are witnessing the development of more or less global linguistic networks. Many languages of the world take part in this process, not just the major languages that are taught as foreign and second languages.

The various language-specific networks meet locally, thus creating local multilingual situations of great complexity. Almost every country (state) in the world is multilingual in some sense. In a small

¹ Parts of this paper are identical with Risager 2004 and Risager (forthcoming a and b).

country like Denmark, for instance, maybe over 100 languages are spoken by various groups of immigrants.

Foreign and second language studies in a global context

Learning and teaching a language means contributing to the spread of the target language to new learners and new contexts. So any language teaching programme is an actor in the continuous formation and reformation of the global network of the target language. Foreign language studies should not confine themselves to the national scenes of the so-called target language countries. They should recognize that all states are multilingual in some sense, including the country where the target language is taught, and the countries in which the target language is the dominant first language. The target language is always in a state of competition with other languages that have perhaps a minority position.

That is why the notion of linguistic area (the French-speaking area, the Russian-speaking area etc.) is problematic. Languages are not territorially bound; of course the specific network of say Danish is especially dense on the Danish territory, but the Danish language network has a global range, as Danish-speaking people can be found in many parts of the world. States have boundaries, languages haven't.

When I speak of language users, I mean all that speak the language, whether it is as first, second or foreign language. In this context, a second language is a language that you learn in childhood or later, and that is the dominant language in the country where you live; so you need the second language to be able to participate in the social life as a citizen. Whereas a foreign language is a language that is studied mainly at a distance, in another country. Of course, one can think of many examples of overlapping between these two prototypical cases.

It is important to have this inclusive concept of language. The students participating in foreign and second (and first) language studies may have many different linguistic backgrounds, they may speak the target language as a first language (native speakers studying their first language abroad), they may speak a minority language and speak the dominant language (for instance Danish in Denmark) as a second language – and the teachers may be equally varied². Because of the strong monolingual focus on the target language, foreign language departments may in fact be multilingual without anybody really noticing it or exploiting it.


As far as target language countries are concerned, parts of the population speak the language in question not as a first language, but as a second language. So you miss an important part of the social and cultural life of the target language country if you restrict the horizon to those who speak and write the language as a first language (mother tongue).

So I would suggest that one way of transgressing the national and monolingual focus of foreign and second language studies should be to further an awareness of the target language as just one language in the whole ecology of languages. One of the objectives of foreign language studies might be to contribute to a multilingual awareness in a global perspective, for instance by way of course work or project work on sociolinguistic issues such as bilingualism, intercultural communication and code-switching (in everyday interaction or as represented in literature, film etc.) (see also Risager 1998).

² Teachers of French in Danish universities have had, among others, Danish, French, Belgian, and Icelandic backgrounds.

Linguistic practice, linguistic resources and the language system

Until now, I have been focusing on language use, or linguistic practice. This focus enables us to develop the image of language use spreading in social networks. But this is only one of the existential loci (or ontologies) of language. One has to distinguish between three loci of language:



Linguistic practice is oral and written interaction in social networks, including the production and reception of literature and other cultural products. Linguistic resources are carried by the individual person; they are the socially constituted knowledge of language, developed as part of the life history of the person. These two loci of language presuppose each other: Linguistic practice cannot be produced and received without linguistic resources carried by individual people, and the linguistic resources of the individual cannot be developed without the experience of linguistic practice.

Whereas these two loci of language are both natural and necessary, the idea of the 'language system' is not. We have to deconstruct the idea that there is a language 'out there' that we can use and study as a natural object. The 'language system' is a construct or, in other words, a family of historically and discursively constructed notions ('English', 'French' etc.). At the same time it is important to note that this construct has consequences for linguistic practice and linguistic resources. The idea of the language system interacts with both linguistic practice and linguistic resources, being a kind of - more or less conscious - normative factor.

I emphasize these three loci in order to point out that there are many kinds of language study beside the sociolinguistic one. Foreign and second language studies should encompass both sociologically oriented studies of language use, and psychologically oriented studies of cognition and competence, and system-oriented studies of phonology, grammar and the lexicon. But these activities should be accomplished with an overall understanding of language as a social phenomenon not limited to the national scene of the target language countries.

A cultural view of language

There are many ways of theorizing the relationship between the social and the cultural. In this limited context, I just want to stress that all societal life may be considered as both social and cultural. The analysis of social life typically deals with relational, temporal and spatial aspects of activities, institutions and structures, whereas the analysis of cultural life typically deals with the production and reproduction of meaning and representations of various realities. The two sides cannot be separated from each other. All social life carries meaning, and all exchanges and negotiations of meaning are embedded in more or less shifting social structures and relations of power.

When we focus on language as a means of forming meaning, we enter an intellectual tradition very different from the sociolinguistic approach I have just outlined. The intimate connections between (specific) languages and (specific) cultures has been a fundamental theme in the nation building process in Europe since the late 18th century, not least in the German form of national romanticism. Foreign language studies since the 19th century have been deeply influenced by this figure of thought, and are just beginning to question the national paradigm and look for alternative ways of conceptualizing the study of language, literature and culture³.

Inseparability or separability?

Nowadays, the most usual and easy way of dealing with the relationship between language and culture is to state that it is a complex relationship, thus verbalizing the difficulties of coming to grips with this thorny question. Those who do formulate an opinion on the issue, may largely be characterized as holding one of two opposite positions:

- language and culture are inseparable
- language and culture are separable

The first view is associated with the cultural turn in linguistics since the 1980s, and is maintained in various forms in research disciplines such as linguistic anthropology, translation studies, and studies of intercultural communication. This is of course also a popular belief among people in general, not least in Europe in the present process of political integration of nation states in a larger union. The second view is mostly associated with the study of English as an international language. In this case it is maintained that languages - and especially English - should be seen as flexible instruments of communication that may in principle be used with any subject matter by anybody anywhere in the world.

As I already said, none of these positions is satisfying. The first one emphasizes that language is culture-bound, and one is not far from a conception of a closed universe of language, people, nation, culture, history, mentality and land. This position is totally at odds with the social and transnational view of language that I have just presented. The other position claims that language is culturally neutral. Language is seen as a code, and one is not far from a reconstitution of the classical structuralist conception of the autonomy of language. To this I would say that no language is culturally neutral. All natural languages (i.e. their users) constantly produce and reproduce culture (i.e. meaning).

The generic and the differential level

At this point I want to emphasize an important thing: In the analysis of the relationship between language and culture, it is necessary to distinguish between on the one hand language and culture in the generic sense, and on the other hand language and culture in the differential sense.

In the generic sense we are talking about language and culture as general human phenomena. The generic sense may be found in two variants: a psychological/cognitive and a social. In the first-mentioned variant language and culture are seen as psychological/cognitive phenomena that have a

³ In my D.Phil. thesis (Risager 2003) I have made a thorough historical analysis of the discourse on language, culture and nation within the discipline of culture pedagogy: the teaching of culture and society as part of foreign and second language teaching (for example: Byram 1986 and 1997, Kramsch 1993, Roberts et al. 2001, Byram and Risager 1999).

(neuro)physiological basis. In the second variant language and culture are seen as social phenomena that have been developed as part of the social life of mankind. At the generic level it doesn't make any sense to maintain that language and culture may be separated. Human culture always includes language, and human language cannot be thought without culture. Linguistic practice is always embedded in, and in interaction with, some cultural, meaningful context.

In the differential sense we are talking about different languages and different cultural phenomena: Specific forms of linguistic knowledge and linguistic practice relating to 'whole' languages, languages varieties, loan words etc. And specific forms of cultural knowledge and cultural practice: different meanings and meaningful forms relating to sign systems as pictures, fashion, food, music, dance etc., different norms and values, symbols, ideas and ideologies. Topics concerning language spread and culture spread belong to the differential level.

In my view much of the confusion concerning the relationship between language and culture may be ascribed to the fact that people do not generally distinguish clearly between the generic and the differential level. It is at the differential level that one may ask for instance: What forms of culture are associated with the Russian language? What forms of culture are associated with the English language?

Linguaculture

I consider the concept of linguaculture to be very useful in the construction of a new understanding of the relationship between language and culture (at the differential level) in a globalised world. The concept of linguaculture has not been widely used until now, but the American linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar has developed it in a book published in 1994⁴. For Agar, linguaculture is a concept that covers language plus culture, and he is especially interested in the variability of linguaculture in discourse (verbal interaction), both among different native users of the same language, and among people who use the language as a native and/or a foreign language. Agar focuses on the semantic and pragmatic variability of linguistic practice, and invites the reader to explore 'rich points' in intercultural communication, i.e. points where communication goes wrong.

Whereas Agar uses the concept of linguaculture in order to theorize the single universe of language and culture, I use it as a concept that may offer us the opportunity to theorize disconnections and reconnections between language and culture as a result of migration and other processes of globalisation. Languages (i.e. language users) spread in social networks, across cultural contexts and discourse communities, but they carry linguaculture with them (this is also suggested in the alternative wording: 'culture in language'). So there are dimensions of culture that are bound to a specific language (linguaculture), and there are dimensions that are not, for instance musical traditions or architectural styles. There may of course be lots of historical links between such cultural phenomena and the language in question, but the point is that the phenomena are not dependent on that specific language.

⁴ He has borrowed this term from Friedrich (1989) who called it linguaculture (see also Risager 2003: 363).

Three dimensions of languaculture

The study of languaculture is the study of the various kinds of meanings carried and produced by language. But what exactly is that? I suggest that we distinguish between three dimensions of languaculture, corresponding to three cultural perspectives on language:

- the semantic and pragmatic potential
- the poetic potential
- the identity potential

The semantic and pragmatic potential is the dimension explored by Agar, and by many others interested in intercultural pragmatics and contrastive semantics. It has also been a longstanding focus of interest for linguistic anthropology since Boas, Sapir and Whorf⁵. This dimension is about constancy and variability in the semantics and pragmatics of specific languages: More or less obligatory distinctions between 'sister' and 'brother', between 'he' and 'she', between 'red' and 'orange', between 'hello' and 'how are you', between 'nature' and 'culture' etc. – and the social and personal variability that is found in concrete situations of use.

The poetic potential is the dimension related to the specific kinds of meaning created in the exploitation of the phonological and syllabic structure of the language in question, its rhymes, its relationships between speech and writing etc. – areas that have for a long time interested literary theorists focusing on literary poetics, style, literariness and the like.

The identity potential is also called social meaning by some sociolinguists (for example Hymes). It is related to the social variation of the language in question: in using the language in a specific way, with a specific accent for instance, you identify yourself and make it possible for others to identify you according to their background knowledge and attitudes. Linguistic practice is a continuing series of 'acts of identity' (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) where people project their own understanding of the world onto the interlocutors and consciously or unconsciously invite them to react. This dimension has been explored by those scholars within sociolinguistics that are interested in the relationship between language and identity⁶.

As I have stressed above, languaculture is both structurally constrained and socially and personally variable. It is a bridge between the structure of language and the socially constituted personal idiolect. The most interesting potentials of the concept may lie in the study of the personal side with a focus on individual semantic connotations and language learning as a process that is integrated in the life history of the individual subject, as a speaker-hearer, a reader and a writer.

Languaculture in the linguistic practice

If we consider languaculture in linguistic practice, oral and written, there is usually a high degree of semantic and pragmatic variability in the process. When a text is produced, languacultural intentions are laid down in the text, intentions concerning how this text is going to function semantically and pragmatically in the situation of communication. What speech acts are intended, what refer-

⁵ And before them, Wilhelm von Humboldt.

⁶ In the following sections I will restrict myself to the first (semantic and pragmatic) dimension because of lack of space.

ences are given to the context, what representations of the world are to be conjured up? These languacultural intentions are restricted or expanded during the reception of the text. The addressees/the readers perceive and interpret the text according to their personal languacultures and their knowledge of the world. A negotiation of meaning is going on.

In situations where the language is used as a foreign language, there are many opportunities of adding even more variability than is the case with native language use, for instance as it is described by Agar in his comments on examples of intercultural communication in English between Austrians and himself.

Languaculture in the linguistic resources

The personal languaculture of the individual cannot be separated from his/her personal life history and social and cultural identity formation. It is not possible to distinguish denotative and connotative dimensions of the personal languaculture.

As for the case where the language is first language (mother tongue), it should be noted that the idea of an intimate relationship between language and culture is primarily about the language in its function as a first language, even if this is rarely explicitly stated. The national-romantic idea of an inner association between the language and the people/nation (and thus the national culture) is in fact about the people who have from their childhood grown up with the mother tongue and the mother tongue culture (in German: 'die muttersprachliche Kultur').

This idea of association between mother tongue and mother tongue culture at the national (or ethnic) level ignores the possibility of great variation between the linguistic and cultural upbringing of different individuals. The acquisition process is in any case socially differentiated, and all human beings develop their personal linguistic and cultural repertoires with which they express themselves and interpret the world. Therefore language and culture are always different from individual to individual, characterized by a specific emotional and cognitive constitution, a specific perspective and a specific horizon of understanding. For example, the meaning of such notions as 'work' and 'leisure' may be quite different even within the same professional group or the same family.

What is the character of the relationship between language and culture when the language is a foreign language? A Dane who is learning German, for instance, especially in the first stages of learning, must draw on his/her cultural and social experience related to the Danish language. There are some semantic and pragmatic distinctions that are obligatory in using German, such as an appropriate distribution of 'du' and 'Sie'. But otherwise it will be natural to use the languaculture developed in relation to the first language (or other languages learnt). Personal connotations to words and phrases will be transferred, and a kind of language mixture will result, where the foreign language is supplied with languacultural matter from another language (in this case Danish, and possibly other languages learnt). From the learner's perspective, the alleged intimate association between German language and culture is a normative one, not a descriptive one. It is his/her task to establish an association, and this task has to be accomplished on the basis of a growing understanding of some of the associations common among native speakers. But even when the learner reaches a high level of competence, his/her languaculture will always be the result of an accumulation of experiences during the whole life history.

Linguaculture in the language system

Since the language system is a discursive construction, the description of linguaculture in the language system is a discursive construction too, where considerations of relevance and utility are to be expected. The description of linguaculture may be placed on a continuum ranging from a minimalist description of the semantic and pragmatic potential of relative constancy – the denotative core of the language – to a maximalist description in the form of a gigantic encyclopedia supplemented by a gigantic handbook of patterns of linguistic practice in specific situations. It should be noted that the structuralist tradition has primarily focused (implicitly) on language as a first language. But some studies of interlanguage (learners' language in development) may be said to build on this tradition (making for instance descriptions of Danes' German interlanguage, or Germans' school English, and the like).

Language/linguaculture and discourse in a global perspective

Linguaculture is related to one or more specific languages. The concept is a theorization of the interface between language and the rest of culture. But the cultural view of language should also embrace the concept of discourse.

The concept of discourse may be used as an intermediary concept between the concepts of language/linguaculture and the more general concept of culture. I refer to the thinking on discourse as for example represented by Fairclough (1992) and other proponents of critical discourse analysis (Wodak, Jäger, van Dijk). Discourse, and discourses, are primarily defined relative to their content: A discourse deals with a certain subject matter from a certain perspective. It is primarily verbally formed, but may be accompanied by for instance visual material.

Discourses may spread across languages. For example, a discourse on Christianity is not bound to any one language, although some languages are more specialized than others as to the verbalisation of topics related to Christianity. Discourses move from language community to language community (of from one linguistic network to another) by processes of translation and other kinds of transformation, and discourses are incorporated into the local language over longer or shorter periods of time. Some discourses are formed as various kinds of literature, and so literary topics, genres and styles spread from language to language.

So, specific languages and specific discourses do not necessarily spread along the same lines (see also Risager 2000). But they may exhibit parallel developments in an area or in a specific linguistic network. Pennycook is among the few people who have analysed relations between language and discourse in this way, with special reference to the question whether colonial discourses adhere to the English language (Pennycook 1998).

Thus the cultural view of language may be said to comprise two levels: the level of linguaculture, bound to specific languages, and the level of discourse, not necessarily bound to any one language (but a discourse has to be expressed in some language at any point of time).

Languages/linguacultures and discourses spread in partly different social networks across cultural contexts - a dynamic image of deconnections and reconnections, of disembedding and reembedding, of processes of cultural influence, domination and integration.

The general ideology of inseparability between language and culture seems to be attributable to two different, but related factors. On the one hand the individual has a tendency of projecting his/her own subjective feeling of association between his/her personal language/languaculture and his/her personal culture and identity onto the community, for example the nation, and thus imagine an association at the system level for which there is no empirical basis. On the other hand this psychological tendency is used politically in national propaganda, where an image is constructed of the nation state characterized by a common national culture expressed in a common national language. Two constructs are articulated together: the idea of the language system and the idea of the culture or cultural system.

Implications for foreign and second language studies⁷

The first implication for foreign and second language studies is that the empirical field in a geographical sense is not 'the language area', but the worldwide network of the target language. Where and in what situations do people speak, read and write the target language? How is the target language used on the internet by ordinary people and interest groups? What role does the language have in transnational migration of all sorts? What role does it have in transnational companies, markets and media? In international politics? In all these situations it is important to consider that the target language carries languaculture with it. It has specific semantic, pragmatic, poetic and identity potentials – both possibilities and limitations. It is partly different from any other language, and this specificity should be an important preoccupation for foreign and second language studies.

The second implication is that the analytical object is not only (texts in) the target language as first language, but also as second and foreign language. The target language is learnt and spoken by many kinds of people and for many different reasons. So an awareness of the complex functions of the target language opens up for studies of multilingualism and multiculturalism in all places where the target language is spoken. How is the target language – French for instance – used by Arabic immigrants in France? How is it used by Chinese immigrants in Canada? These kinds of questions raise issues of relations between language and identity: the use and construction of linguistic identities and the role of language in the construction of cultural identities, national or ethnic, etc. They also raise issues of the role of languages in the power structures of society and the world. They may focus attention on various forms of linguistic and cultural encounters and conflicts, and on processes of translation and interpretation - linguistic and cultural. They may lead to insights into the great languacultural variability of the language in question.

The third implication is that the study of a specific language is not confined to specific discourses or specific thematic areas (disciplinary fields). As discourses, topics and genres may spread from language to language by various kinds of translation or transformation, a language community is never a closed discourse community, though there may be certain discourses that are preferred in certain local and social contexts at certain points of time. Thus it is not necessarily so that language studies should always focus on the (native) literature of target language countries. The link between the study of language and the study of literature is not a natural one, it is a historical construction that was once important in the nation-building processes. When this link is maintained today, it has to be specially motivated, for foreign language studies may as well focus on social studies, cultural studies, media studies, business studies, workplace studies, art studies etc. etc.

⁷ As I have hinted at several times, I think these reflexions are also relevant for the teaching and learning of languages as first languages, but space prevents me from developing this issue further here.

The fourth implication is that it is necessary to construct foreign language studies that are characterized by an integrative view of both language, text, discourse and (the rest of) culture and society. For instance, the target language should be seen as a cultural phenomenon, and simultaneously literature and other texts in the target language should be seen as linguistic phenomena. Although texts are usually studied as cultural products carrying some kind of global content or meaning (representing cultural reality in some way or other), they are always also instances of linguistic practice in a specific language.

It is important to try to counteract the unfortunate traditional division between studies of language, literature and history/society in foreign and second language studies. This does not mean that the histories of the different academic traditions should not be acknowledged. But it means that the problems of modern (and not-so-modern) life should be approached as complex problems demanding a range a different means of analysis and interpretation. We need interdisciplinary approaches to everyday phenomena of intercultural learning and communication, oral and written. We need to study these phenomena with combinations of theories originating both in linguistics (incl. sociolinguistics and cultural linguistics), in literary studies (incl. studies of all sorts of texts in the media), and in social and historical studies more generally.

One way of furthering this idea is to introduce problem-oriented project work as a central form of study, supplemented by course work. The task of looking for and defining social and cultural problems may offer opportunities for students and teachers/supervisors to develop a sense of the interdisciplinary nature and potentials of foreign language studies. A project work (in French) on problems of intercultural understanding raised by the use of childrens' books, produced in France, in a small rural community in Bourkina Faso, would perhaps illustrate the necessity of applying both linguistic, cultural and historical knowledge (theories and methods) in order to understand the problems involved.

In conclusion, we need a redefinition of language and culture pedagogy that transcends the national paradigm and introduces a dynamic transnational and global perspective, including multilingual awareness, centering on the study of meaning as it is produced in the interface of languaculture and discourse⁸.

References

- Agar, Michael 1994. *Language Shock. Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: William Morrow
- Byram, Michael 1989. *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Byram, Michael 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Byram, Michael and Karen Risager 1999. *Language Teachers, Politics and Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Fairclough, Norman 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Friedrich, Paul 1989. Language, ideology, and political economy. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 91: 295-312
- Hannerz, Ulf 1992. *Cultural Complexity. Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Kramsch, Claire 1993. *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

⁸ Many of the ideas expressed in this paper have been developed into a Master's programme at Roskilde University. The programme is called 'Cultural Encounters', and focuses on studies of culture and language related to questions of identity, ethnicity, nationality, multilingualism and multiculturalism, discourse studies, post-colonial studies and studies of cultural and linguistic globalisation. There is no specific target language so the programme does not aim primarily at language learning. Thus it is not in itself a foreign language study programme, but foreign language studies may be inspired by it.

- Le Page, R. and A. Tabouret-Keller 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Pennycook, Alastair 1998. *English and the discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge
- Risager, Karen 1998. Language teaching and the process of European integration. in: Michael Byram and Michael Fleming eds *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective. Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 242-54
- Risager, Karen 2000. Bedeutet Sprachverbreitung immer auch Kulturverbreitung? in: Ulrich Ammon Hrsg., *Sprachförderung. Schlüssel auswärtiger Kulturpolitik*. Frankfurt a. M. etc.: Peter Lang, 9-18
- Risager, Karen 2003. *Det nationale dilemma i sprog- og kulturpædagogikken. Et studie i forholdet mellem sprog og kultur*. København: Akademisk Forlag
- Risager, Karen 2004. A Social and Cultural View of Language. in: Hans Lauge Hansen ed. *Disciplines and Interdisciplinarity*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 21-34
- Risager, Karen (forthcoming a). Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture pedagogy. in: Stephen May ed. *The LED Conference Proceedings*, The University of Waikato, New Zealand
- Risager, Karen (forthcoming b). *Language and Culture. Global Flows and Local Complexity*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Roberts, Celia et al. 2001. *Language Learners as Ethnographers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Miriam Schildkraut: Linguistic socialization and social identity: Arab students in a mixed college in Israel
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
197-211
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Miriam Schildkraut and the Editors, 2005

Linguistic socialization and social identity Arab students in a mixed college in Israel¹

Miriam Schildkraut

Kaye College of Education, Beer-Sheva, Israel
schildkraut@012.net.il

Abstract

The following article brings results from an error analysis of data collected from Arab students whose L1 is Arabic and L2 is Hebrew. The subjects participated in a Project of Democracy and Co-Existence between Arab and Jewish students, which took place in a teacher training college in Israel in the school year of 2001-2002. The research focused on checking the extent of the variability that occurred in the Hebrew used by the subjects because of their interaction with the Jewish students (for whom Hebrew is obviously their L1). The data is comparative and pertains to the differences found between the achievements in Hebrew of the participants in each one of the two optional groups: the Democracy group, which consisted of Arab students only, (hence referred to as “homogeneous”), and the Co-Existence group, which consisted of both Jewish and Arab students (hence referred to as “mixed”). All Arab participants also attended, as part of their formal requirements, a course in Hebrew throughout their studies in the college.

Theoretical background

The research, which checks the linguistic aspects of the relationship between two national groups – Jews and Arabs, stems from a socio-psychological theory called the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (hence ODT), (Brewer 1991) (see below), which itself can be regarded as a follow-up of a few variants of the classical social and sociolinguistic theories which thrived in the late 70s and throughout the 80s.

The first is the Social Identity Theory (SIT), according to which a group creates not only a social, but also a psychological reality, so that every member of it, apart from having the individual identity, which he bears from the moment of his birth, also shares the identity of the group he belongs to (Tajfel 1982, Turner et al 1987). In other words, one’s personal identity is comprised of both his individual identity, which consists of various personality traits, and of one’s social identity which the individual acquires by belonging to a certain social group on the basis of traits shared by all of its members, such

¹ The research described in this article is part of a doctoral dissertation bearing the same name.

as: gender, nationality, religion, political party, academic status, sports group, place of residence etc. According to this view, there is a dialectical relationship between the individual and the society, which is mediated by the social identity and which unfolds in three phases:

- Human beings are born into an existent structure and into a fixed category (according to gender, skin colour, parental affiliation, place of birth, status etc.), in this respect, the social structure is prior to the human being.
- If all the members of the existing groups accept the existing ideology (which usually belongs to the dominant group), and at the same time identify with the characteristics of their own category, they acquire a definite social identity.
- This identity generates their self-concept, which might be either positive or negative. At the same time, belonging to a subordinate group might cause its members to generate a negative identity followed by a low self-esteem. In this case, they might be willing to try to improve their social status. This is the point when a series of changes might be launched and the whole social structure becomes dynamic.

Two strategies might be engaged for this sake: social mobility and social change. We will elaborate here more on the former since it is more relevant for our purposes.

This strategy depends on the view that the borders between the social groups are permeable and enable the individuals to pass from one group to another relatively easily. If the passage succeeds, thanks to hard work, helpful social acquaintances, linguistic accommodation (see below), etc., they, and probably their relatives as well, will be redefined as members of the dominant group, getting all the relevant social benefits.

The follow-up of this milestone theory was the Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory (hence EIT) (Ball, Giles and Hewstone 1984), which applied the SIT to the relationship between majority and minority groups in a society. This theory opted to predict the linguistic changes that would possibly occur in the languages of various ethnic groups under different circumstances. The advantage of this theory is its ability to integrate social structure and individual linguistic behaviour in the case of various ethnic groups operating simultaneously.

The next step was the Linguistic Accommodation Theory (hence LAT) (Giles 1984), which is actually embedded in the EIT and aims at both explaining the systematic differences which occur in this ethnolinguistic arena and predicting the possible trends of development. In fact, the linguistic changes fall into two major categories:

- a convergence process, when the speaker is trying to adopt (to a lesser or greater extent) the linguistic characteristics of the addressee while abandoning those of her own. This is aimed at weakening the original traits of her social belonging in order to help her pass into the addressee's group.
- a divergence process, when the speaker sticks to her original linguistic characteristics and emphasizes her original identity.

One of these two processes might be used by the speakers wishing to either improve their social identity or rather emphasize their unwillingness to integrate.

And yet, since things are often not as schematic as they might seem from the above scenarios, let us have a closer look at the Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (hence ODT), which seems to reflect our case much more accurately. According to this theory, human beings are motivated to achieve a balance between contrasting needs: on the one hand, the need to assimilate in order to accentuate the feeling of belonging to groups which enjoy positive social value, and on the other hand, there is the need to diverge in order to preserve the feeling of independence and the original, unique identity. Brewer assumes the two-directional movement is simultaneous.

The ODT was, indeed, the socio-psychological starting point of the following research. The SIT and its follow-ups were accepted as valid, but because we deal here with two national groups, it is not surprising that we have found a mixed pattern which seems to have reflected simultaneously the contrasting wishes on the part of the subjects in question: to gain acceptance on the one hand without losing their original identity on the other.

Research on Israeli multiculturality

In addition to these classical sociolinguistic theories, we should now examine some of the data obtained from the current fieldwork in the sphere of multicultural group-work in Israel. We will offer here just a brief overview, since the focus of that work is not linguistic. However, the social dilemmas, which have been uncovered there, shed some very significant light on the results obtained by this research, since the linguistic modification we are dealing with occurred among the participants of a multicultural group as well.

The following summary pertains to a number of research papers all conducted in Israel in the late 90s on various aspects of the Israeli multiculturality (Kacén & Lev-Wiesel, 2002). The existing data encompasses a great deal of the social variety and social polarity of Israel: Jews and Arabs, Oriental Jews and those coming from the Western countries, secular, moderate religious and orthodox communities, veteran citizens and new immigrants, northern Arabs and southern Bedouins, residents of urban centers, and rural settlements (such as kibbutz or moshav). In addition to these, we also find the heated political disputes between Right and Left Wing ideologies, representing respectively those who dream about keeping all the conquered territories and those willing to give them back and support the establishment of a Palestinian state.

Such a structure inhibits the prospect of successful social integration. The deeper the discrepancies and the more vocal and outspoken the sectorial ideologies are, the poorer the economic resources, and the bigger the needs, the more tense and hostile the inter-group relations become. The increasing hostility, which has lately become characteristic of the whole of Israeli society, endangers the general status quo and is hazardous to the stability of the whole social system.

In view of this, the current discourse in Israel, both personal and public, not surprisingly expresses a lot of heated emotions, covering the genuine anxiety for fragile, personal welfare. Mautner, Sagi and Shamir (1988) claim that a dialogue between conflicting groups today reflects a competition and a

struggle over resources rather than a real dialogue. Bar-On (1999) finds the outcome of this situation in a demonisation of the “other”.

Such a social climate leads to the loss of a rational attitude to the various conflicts and to the emergence of externalised, irrational emotions of hatred towards the opposite stands. There is no doubt that, as long as this heated atmosphere does not change, it would be rather difficult to view the Israeli society as really multicultural, where different cultures exist side by side in a relative harmony and enjoy both respect and legitimacy from the individuals as well as from the establishment itself (Leonetti, 1994).

The following are some of the conclusions reached by the group of researchers working with several conflicting groups in Israel (all data provided by Kacen & Lev-Wiesel 2002):

All the researchers unanimously agree that it is not enough to provide an opportunity for an encounter between conflicting sides, especially when the conflict is historical, ideological and national and has been fostered for a great many years. They claim that a real dialogue can be created only provided emotional and cognitive barriers have been overcome first. Otherwise, any attempt to create a mutual openness will probably fail right from the start:

- Sagi, Steinberg and Faheraldin, who studied a mixed group of Jewish and Arab students at the Ben-Gurion University in Beer-Sheva (a group very similar to the one reported in our research), claim that a significant encounter between the participants of such a group can only occur at the micro-level, focusing on what they call “the personal rather than the collective I”.
- Lev-Wiesel claims that a genuine encounter between conflicting groups is always emotional, not rational.
- Bar-On (2000), working with second generation Holocaust victims and their German creators, believes that the encounter was possible due to the empathy that was created as a result of each participant first being encouraged to tell his own personal story.
- The personal experience can either precede or follow other phases of the group encounter, for instance, conflicting political stands are externalized, but the encounter becomes significant only after emotional bridges have been constructed between the conflicting sides.

We will later examine the linguistic implications of these conclusions.

Before we start presenting the data, it seems appropriate to look into the nature of the unique national group in question.

The Arab Minority in Israel

The Arab population in Israel comprises a national minority of 20% of the total population. This national minority interacts with the Jewish population, which is the national majority in the country. However, on the Israeli scene the concept of nationality is tricky, since there is no separation between religion and nationality in the state, and since the ordinary meaning of the concept as it is known from other Western countries, here is referred to through citizenship. Furthermore, Israel has never devel-

oped a notion of Israeli nationality, which would encompass all its citizens as it is in the case of the American nationality, for instance, including all American citizens, or in the case of Spain, where the notion of Spanish nationality includes both Castilians from Madrid and Catalonians from Barcelona.

Things are even trickier in the Arab sector. Israeli Arabs are Israeli citizens just like Jews, but their nationality is considered Arabic. Furthermore, parallel to the notion of the “Jewish people”, the Arabs have the notion of the “Arab people”, though they assign it a totally different meaning. From their point of view, the Arab people is comprised of a few nations mainly according to the territory they live on, and as a result, we get the Egyptian nation, the Saudi-Arabian nation, the Iraqi nation etc., and in the Israeli case, they refer to themselves as the Palestinian nation (or part of it) whose place of residence is Israel.

All this plays a role when we come to understand some of the reasons for the tension that exists between the Arab population and the state of Israel. The Arab sector strives to be regarded as a national minority both because it has feelings of belonging to the Great Arabic People (living mostly in the Middle East) and because there is no all-encompassing Israeli nationality that would embrace it as well. However, the state of Israel is strongly hesitant on this issue, mainly because it fears the political implications of a case, such as claim for territories within the state, or other signs of political sovereignty (Samoocha 1996).

As a consequence, the Arab sector is traditionally viewed by the state only as an ethnic group which is entitled to a lot of freedom with respect to linguistic, cultural and various folkloristic matters, but to no freedom at all with respect to issues of national independence with a symbolic significance, such as a flag, a capital city or a national anthem.

Indeed, if we examine in more detail the language policy pertaining to the Arab minority, we will find autonomy on the following issues: First, Arabic is considered as one of the two official languages of Israel, side by side with Hebrew. As a result, all official forms are either written bilingually or have an Arabic version. Signposts on roads or in public places are bilingual as well. In addition, Arabic is recognized officially as the L1 of the Arab citizens and consequently is used as the formal language of instruction throughout the educational system, from kindergarten up to high school. Hebrew, however, is taught as a compulsory L2 from fourth grade onwards. It is only in the academic institutions, colleges or universities, that Hebrew becomes the language of instruction. In addition to this, there is also free press in Arabic, as well as a newsreel on both radio and television.

These facts play a important role in trying to understand the linguistic behaviour of Arab citizens in Israel, facing the choice of manoeuvring between the two languages at their disposal (we ignore English, which is their compulsory L3, since it is irrelevant in this context).

Attention should be drawn to yet another fact: There is a large discrepancy between the northern Arabs, be it Muslims, Christians or Druze and the southern Arabs called Bedouins. The gaps are significant on most levels in favour of the northern group, but the situation is especially painful when it comes to education. This is not the appropriate place to elaborate on these matters, but we will just mention the fact that all the Bedouins of the south, to which all the informants of this research belong, were former nomads, some of them partially still are, some have been forced to settle in modern villages, which the

elderly often despise, since they view this as a hostile act of resettlement. At most places it is possible to find emerging disputes between the older and younger generations over all issues pertaining to modernity, be it the extent to which one should still adhere to tradition, accept the dictates of the government with respect to the place of residence or feel motivated to learn the Hebrew language beyond the compulsory basics.

We will refer to this issue again while analysing the results of the research in front of us.

The Kaye College of Education

Let us first start with a brief look at the setting the research took place in.

Kaye College is a teacher-training college situated in Beer-Sheva, which is the biggest city in the southern part of Israel. It has about a thousand regular students, studying for their B.Ed. in Teaching, and about the same number who studies in special, short-term target courses of various types. About 30% of the regular students are Arabs, mainly Bedouins from the South. Only about 10% of the total number of the Arab students, and usually even less, come from the north of Israel, and they are usually on a higher level than those from all the southern vicinity.

On the whole, the Arab students study in the framework of their sector, where courses dealing with Arab culture, language and tradition as well as courses in Methodology and Didactics (applied specifically to the Arab sector) are taught in Arabic. This is true for the vast majority of the Arab college students, apart from the very few ones (around 20-30) who specialize in the junior-high stream and take integrative courses with the Jewish students in Methodology and Didactics as well.

All Arab students take three compulsory courses in Hebrew (one per year). In addition, they study together with the Jewish students in the compulsory courses of Computers and English, which are taken in the first year only.

It is quite clear from this picture that there is only scarce, and often close to no interaction between the Arab and Jewish populations in the college, apart from those few Arab students studying in the junior-high stream, or the very rare cases of Arab male students who specialize in Physical Education (roughly 2-3 a year, and sometimes none) and who join the general P.E. stream (which is mostly Jewish).

This is why the Co-Existence project, which is available for the Arab students when they are in their third year of studies, provides them with a unique opportunity to meet the Jewish students under different circumstances and perhaps for the first time to develop a significant acquaintance with them.

We will now take a closer look at this unique framework.

The Project of Co-Existence and Democracy

The project is a unique unit in the college where students of both sides meet in a framework of workshops in one of two possible streams, 'Co-Existence' and 'Democracy':

The Project of Co-Existence and Democracy

103 students

Co-existence:

3 mixed groups, in total: 29 Arab students (9 + 10 + 10) and 25 Jewish students (9 + 8 + 8)

Democracy:

3 homogeneous groups, in total: 49 Arab students (16 + 16 + 17)

The research was conducted in the college in the school year of 2001-2002

For various internal reasons related to a non-identical structure of the studies in the Jewish and the Arab sectors, all Arab third-year students were included in the project, whereas for the Jewish students it was an elective course. In order to grant the Arab students with at least a certain feeling of choice, and at the same time to solve the problem of the uneven number of students on both sides, two optional streams were created for the Arab students: one, which consisted of a mixed population of both Jewish and Arab participants and focused on matters of co-existence, and the other, which consisted of Arab students only (hence called “homogeneous”) and focused on matters of democracy with a specific emphasis on the rights of a minority in a modern, democratic state.

In both frameworks, the language of instruction was Hebrew. In the mixed groups, Hebrew was used both by L1 speakers (the Jewish students) and by L2 speakers (the Arab students), while in the homogeneous groups, it was used by L-2 speakers only. In both kinds of groups, the students participated in workshops (rather than in frontal lessons), sitting in a circle discussing matters or taking part in activities that the instructor brought up. All participants went on two outings, one per semester, and all prepared one minor project at the end of the first term and a final, major project at the end of the year. All projects were done in teams (usually pairs or quartets). In the case of the mixed groups, all teams, who spent quite a substantial time on preparing the projects, always had to be mixed too.

The aim of this research was twofold: first, following the LAT (see above), the aim was to check to what extent the Bedouins’ participation in mixed or in homogeneous groups and experiencing varying amounts of interaction with the Jewish students, indeed affected their performance in Hebrew.

In other words, in terms of this research, the differences in the performance of Hebrew which were expected to be found between the participants of the mixed groups and those of the homogeneous groups were explained in the following way:

Since all the informants took compulsory courses in Hebrew, it was believed that a possible discrepancy between the Hebrew of the participants of the mixed groups and those of the homogeneous groups with respect to various parameters of Hebrew could well be expected. It was further assumed that the discrepancy in performance would be in favour of the participants of the mixed groups. Such results could validly be interpreted as a consequence of being exposed both to more linguistic input in the target language and to stronger social integration and intra-group communication (Ellis 1998, Krashen 1985).

However, a possible correlation between better results in L2 acquisition with a greater motivation to integrate with Israeli society at large, and the students of the college in particular, could possibly be seen as a result of convergence compatible with the LAT. Apart from conducting a sheer linguistic analysis, this is why we also looked into the participants' attitudes to the target language and then checked the correlation between the two.

Data was collected from both the mixed and the homogeneous groups four times during the school year in two ways: Since spontaneous speech was impossible to get as due to the participants' refusal to be recorded, they were asked to write short pieces of free writing in Hebrew on any one of a list of subjects offered to them. In addition to this, syntactic competence was also checked by having them choose between correct and erroneous sentences presented to them on questionnaires.

It should be noted that minor differences were already traced in favour of the future participants of the mixed groups on the very first test in Hebrew, which was given right before the project had started. This, of course, can be explained in several ways and we shall elaborate on this point in the concluding section.

The data was measured on three parameters of the students linguistic competence – the grammatical, the stylistic and the lexical. These three parameters were chosen since each one of them reflects a different aspect of language: grammar, which is a rule-governed system, reflects the formal aspect and as such, lends itself to formal instruction; style reflects the subjective aspect since it is usually a matter of choice (Crystal 1992), and the lexicon provides a very interesting tool for assessing both linguistic competence in terms of richness and appropriateness of vocabulary, and attitudinal changes. It was assumed that these three aspects may offer a convenient tool for detecting traits of either convergence or divergence.

The tool for assessment was error analysis which measured, in quantitative terms, the progress made with respect to each parameter throughout the year, and then compared the results between the two kinds of groups: mixed and homogeneous.

A general remark concerning methodology should be made here, however: In all the calculations, the sentence was regarded as the basic unit of measurement so that every error, be it grammatical, stylistic or lexical, got maximum one point, no matter how many times an error of the same kind appeared in a sentence. The number of errors of the same kind in one and the same sentence was ignored intentionally but errors of different kinds were calculated. This was done to enable comparison between the groups.

Let us now look at what happened on each of the three levels in question (Chart no. 1):

The difference between the groups with respect to errors

Figures represent percents

at the beginning of the project:

	grammatical	stylistic	lexical
mixed	22	81	12
homogeneous	25	84	16

in the middle of the first semester:

	grammatical	stylistic	lexical
mixed	23	78	11
homogeneous	25	83	15

in the middle of the second semester:

	grammatical	stylistic	lexical
mixed	20	64	9
homogeneous	24	78	14

at the end of the year:

	grammatical	stylistic	lexical
mixed	14	45	6
homogeneous	20	78	14

Chart no. 1

Grammatical level

Errors found at this level fall into several categories: First, there is a large group of syntactic errors, with cases such as subject-verb disagreement in terms of number or gender. Since Hebrew is a language where both nouns, verbs and adjectives can be pluralized, it would be unacceptable in a sentence to have a subject in the plural and its verb in the singular. Besides, nouns in Hebrew are classified as either masculine or feminine, and furthermore, adjectives and verbs have gender as well. A lack of correlation between these parameters in a sentence is considered erroneous as seen in the following example:

**betach she-hajamim ha-achronim shinta et daati.*
(surely that the days the last changed my mind.)

The problem arises because the noun which functions as the subject, and its adjacent adjective appear correctly in the plural of the masculine form, whereas the verb that follows is both in the singular and

in the feminine form. In other words, we have here a case of double disagreement, both in terms of number, plural-singular, and in terms of gender, masculine-feminine.

Another kind of grammatical error falls into the category of either misplacement or a total lack of prepositions, connectives or other vital components, such as demonstratives or pronouns:

**ani choshevet ha-jeladim son'im et habanot sham.*
(I think the kids hate the girls there.)

This sentence lacks the connective “that” following the verb “think” which in Hebrew is indispensable. (The reason for this very frequent error is most probably negative transfer from Arabic, where such sentences are possible).

Another kind of grammatical error is a lack of balance in terms of attaching the article “the” only to one out of two words in a phrase:

**ani roah tzad ha-sheni hu lo tov.*
(I see side the other it's no good).

In Hebrew, in a sequence of adjective-noun, the article “the” should either precede both words or not appear at all; otherwise an unbalanced, and therefore an unacceptable structure follows.

From the research the following result with respect to grammar were found. The difference between the two types of groups exists but is not very significant on the first test. Then, about two months later, on the second test, we see an increase in errors in the mixed group although we see no progress in the homogenous group: from 22% at the beginning of the year to 23% in the middle of the first semester. There may be two different reasons for this result. First, it might be a random, insignificant occurrence. In this case, we would say that among these participants, just like among those of the other group, two months after the beginning of the project, there was still no real progress made.

Secondly, perhaps we might not unreasonably assume that since these highly motivated participants got very positively encouraged to communicate with their peers from the other national group, and since the atmosphere was reported as fairly supportive, the subjects might have felt quite comfortable to speak freely. Under these circumstances, the increase in errors probably reflected an increase in their initiative and in the total bulk of the speech that they produced, including an increase in more complex sentences. In other words, this new complexity resulted in producing more errors, especially as regards structure.

If this explanation is accurate, these errors should be seen in a positive light, since they actually reflected much greater and more vivid communication than they handled only a short time earlier.

Then the trend changed towards the end of the first half of the second semester. At that point we can see a decline in errors in both types of groups. The participants in the mixed groups made quite a remarkable progress, going down from 23% to 20% errors, while in the homogeneous groups there was just a slight movement from 25% to 24%. The fourth test at the end of the year showed a substantial

progress on the part of all participants, with better results in the mixed groups. Here, the subjects moved from 20% on the third exam to 14% on the final one, which produces a total of 27.2% improvement since the beginning of the year. At the same time, the subjects in the homogeneous groups moved from 24% on the third exam to 20% on the final one, which results in a total improvement of 20% since the beginning of school year.

All in all, it is quite evident that grammatical knowledge of Hebrew was acquired in both groups, probably non-relatedly to the subjects' participation in the double-streamed project. The progress might quite reasonably be related to the compulsory lessons of Hebrew taken by the Arab students.

Still, two differences between the two types of groups should not be ignored. First, the participants of the mixed groups made a much more remarkable progress than those in the homogeneous groups in quantitative terms. In addition to this, qualitatively speaking, they seemed to be much more willing to express themselves. Their pieces of writing were much longer than those of their peers in the homogeneous groups and they used more complex language while trying to express themselves. In the homogeneous groups, most of the subjects used simpler sentences, both structurally and lexically, and to a great extent, this simplicity and relative linguistic poverty stayed unchanged throughout the year.

Stylistic level

In this category, we find errors mainly of the following kinds: a mixture of formal and informal register appearing simultaneously in the same discourse, and sometimes even in the same sentence, redundant connectors and anaphoras and a large number of run-on sentences:

ha-avira shesarera bemahalach hapi shot **hi meshakefet mi anachnu.*
(the atmosphere that prevailed in the course of the meetings **it** reflects who we are).

hapeulot shehoavru **hem mat'imim lishnei hatzdadim.*
(The activities that were carried out **they** are suitable for both sides).

In the above sentences, the anaphoric pronoun which is placed between the extended subject and the verb is redundant, and therefore erroneous, in Hebrew. This sentence presents another problem, namely that it is a borderline case between grammatical and stylistic errors. This is so, since, structurally speaking, we have a redundant component. However, the case of the redundant anaphora has become a major trait of the Hebrew spoken by Arab speakers and has penetrated even folkloristic imitations of such speech. (The second sentence has a grammatical error as well but it is ignored here on purpose).

Another stylistic mistake is mixing formal and informal registers in the same sentence:

**hashiurim haju achla aval ani lo margisha shehem mevinim ma avar al amejnu.*
(The lessons were cool but I don't feel that they understand what passed on our nation.)

The problem with this sentence is that the first clause contains the slang word *achla*, which has the meaning of "cool" or "great" and is used mostly by young speakers. Interestingly, it was borrowed into Hebrew from Arabic, and now the Arab speakers imitating Hebrew slang, use it as part of their conver-

gence to the “cool Israeli youth”, using it as an Israeli modernism, as a sign of belonging to the “cool users of slang”, not as a word from Arabic! However, the second clause of this sentence includes the very formal word *amejnu*, meaning “our nation”, and is a formal combination of the standard, uncombined form of *am shelanu*, meaning exactly the same. No native speaker of Hebrew would use both the word in slang in the first clause and this combined formal word in one and the same sentence. With respect to these two words, it is reasonable to surmise that this unacceptable usage is simply a matter of a lack of awareness of their operating on different levels of formality.

In fact, stylistic problems are sometimes difficult to detect since they are hidden in otherwise grammatical sentences. And yet, they form the dominant characteristic of the erroneous speech performed by the subjects in both types of groups.

Once again, we see that right from the start, the subjects in the mixed groups did better than their peers in the homogeneous groups (81% vs. 84% respectively). However, unlike the situation on the syntactic level, the changes that took place here were indeed remarkable in two ways: first, all subjects made constant progress in terms of style, though the dramatic changes which took place in the mixed groups going down in big leaps from 78% on the second exam to 64% on the third, then further down to 45% on the final, resulted in 44.4% of total improvement the mixed group achieved, compared with only 7.1% of improvement in the homogeneous groups.

These figures strongly suggest that style is mainly affected by communicative interaction (the way it happened in the mixed groups) and no results even slightly reminiscent of this rank can ever be achieved through formal instruction only.

However, not all stylistic features were affected in the same way. Erroneous switch of register was the first to decline, though as it has been pointed out to a much greater extent in the mixed groups. With respect to the run-on sentences, little progress was made in both groups, though again the mixed ones yielded better results, and the slight progress which did occur, was sometimes overshadowed by the attempt to express complex ideas. With respect to misplaced or redundant connectors, the picture is not one-dimensional. In some cases, this kind of error has disappeared completely, while in others, especially in the homogeneous groups certain connectives such as *ve-gam*, meaning “and also”, seem to be most stubborn, possibly a matter of fossilization.

Lexical level

This aspect of linguistic competence is closely connected to the stylistic one, and yet, it is the most intricate to test. For various reasons the lexical level is difficult to assess. Only in very few cases a certain word is clearly a matter of wrong choice. An example from English might clarify the point. Although the adjectives *high* and *tall* obviously share some semantic features, it would be wrong to say **a high person* or **a tall mountain*. However, what do we do with a sequence such as:

Oh, thank you for the nice food.

How do we know whether the speaker, obviously wishing to complement the food he liked, actually wanted to say “nice”, or rather had the idea of “tasty” in mind. But having forgotten the word in the

foreign language he was using, he said instead “nice”, hoping it would convey at least some of the positive feelings he had.

How can we be sure about these vague cases at all? And what should we do about a mistaken sequence of the following kind:

**I have friends who spoke me about the course.*

Should we regard the missing preposition *to*, which was supposed to follow the verb *spoke* as a syntactic error or rather as a lexical one, assuming that the speaker confused *spoke* with *told*?

In addition to this problem, a strikingly poor vocabulary is another problem not susceptible to a quantitative analysis. No doubt, it would be useful to explore these matters with qualitative tools, but this is not our concern here.

As we can see, the assessment of the lexical competence through the prism of error analysis is not an easy matter at all. As mentioned earlier, we ignored the fact that some sentences had more than one erroneous lexical item, and assigned every erroneous sentence (with one error or more) just one point, as we did with the syntactic and the stylistic parameters.

Here too, from the very start we could see a discrepancy between the performance of subjects in both groups. The 4% gap in favour of the mixed groups at the outset turned into 8% at the end of the year. The meaning of this is that the participants of the homogeneous groups have undergone almost no significant lexical change at all, and the progress of 12.5% they made was very scarce. At the same time, the subjects in the mixed groups have made an extremely remarkable progress of 50% fewer errors at the end of the year.

Conclusions

The results of this research show the unbeatable consequences of a social interaction that creates not only the physical setting for spontaneous speech and an extensive exposure to the target language, but also those rare and dear moments of real dialogue. As reported by Kacen and Lev-Wiesel (2002), it was only after those “dialogical moments” (Steinberg, in Kacen and Lev-Wiesel) were created and emotional openness followed, that it was possible to observe a change of conduct on the part of the participants. The results obtained by this research seem to reflect the same reality and support the same conclusions from a linguistic perspective. There is no doubt that dealing with conflicting groups and having them sit in a circle and participate in a workshop seems to create favourable circumstances. These might enhance a whole variety of social dynamics, which in turn, might be well reflected through the linguistic prism.

There is no doubt that the greatest effect of the interaction between both populations takes place on the stylistic and lexical levels. Here, the convergence to Hebrew speakers seems very remarkable and clearly noticeable. The grammatical development, however, does not seem to be the result of an unconscious process of convergence, but rather a result of formal instruction which was enhanced by rational reasons such as the need to meet academic requirements of a college, and the awareness that it is within

the interests of the subjects themselves to acquire Hebrew in order to settle better in life, socially and economically.

This point should be well understood. The motives for grammatical and stylistic or lexical improvement are quite different. While grammatical competence in L2 usually reflects the level of mastery of the target language, it is the richness of the lexicon and mastery of the local style which will usually render the outsider (who can be any kind of outgroup, either total foreigner or a member of a minority group) a rewarding feeling of belonging. On the Israeli scene, a successful adoption of stylistic features might help the foreign speaker to sound more mainstream Israeli, more like someone from the dominant group.

What should be remembered here is that due to the language policy in Israel, which practically enables the Arab citizens to speak Arabic as their legitimate L1 freely in Israel, and have it as the official language of instruction at schools, there is no danger that Arabic is ever going to disappear or be forgotten by its native speakers. In this respect, the classical models of the SIT and LAT as they were designed by Giles, Taylor, McKirnan and their colleagues in Europe, considering various minority languages in Europe, America and elsewhere, do not fit the Israeli situation. These models do not fit since they refer to linguistically endangered minorities. Linguistically speaking, the Arab minority in Israel is very strong. This is precisely the reason why some of the Arab speakers, provided they have the motivation to integrate in Jewish mainstream society, choose to elaborate on their Hebrew. They do so through partial or total linguistic convergence without any need to undergo anything that would remotely echo Hamlet's dilemma. It is not a question of this language or that one, of to be or not to be. This is why Brewer, with her two-directional model is much more appropriate here. It is possible both to acquire remarkably good Hebrew (for utilitarian or other reasons) without feeling a traitor who abandons his tribe, and yet remain a very proud Arab, who studies and uses his language whenever and wherever he sees fit.

References

- Amara, M. and B. Spolsky 1983. The Diffusion and Integration of Hebrew and English Lexical Items in the Spoken Arabic of an Israeli Village. *Anthropological Linguistics* 28:43-54.
- Ball, P., H. Giles and M. Hewstone 1984. Second language acquisition: the intergroup theory with catastrophic dimensions. In: H. Tajfel, ed. *The Social Dimension: European Developments in Social Psychology*, vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barbour, S. and C. Carmichael, eds. 2000. *Language and Nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, J.W., Y.H. Poortinga, M.H. Segall, and P.R. Dasen 1996. *Cross-Cultural Psychology, Research and Applications*. Ch.12: Ethnic groups and minorities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, M.B. 1991. The social self: on being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17:475-482.
- Cooper, R. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*, ch.7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1998. *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giles, H., ed 1984. The dynamics of speech accommodation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46, whole issue.
- Hoffmann, Charlotte. 1996. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hogg, Michael and Dominic Abrams 1996. *Social Identifications: a social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Kacen, Lea and Rachel Lev-Wiesel, eds. 2002. *Group Work in a Multicultural Society*. Tel-Aviv: Tcherikover.
- Krashen, S. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London and New York: Longman.

- Lambert, W.E. and D.M. Taylor 1996. Language in the lives of ethnic minorities: Cuban American families in Miami, *Applied Linguistics* 17:477-500.
- Leonetti, I.T. 1994. From multicultural to intercultural: Is it necessary to move from one to the other? In: James Lynch, Celia Modgil & Sohan Modgil, eds. *Cultural Diversity and the Schools*. London and Washington, D.C.: Falmer.
- Olshtain, E. and G. Horenchuk, eds. 2000. *Language, Identity and Immigration*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Schmidt, R. 1983. Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In: N. Wolfson and E. Judd, eds. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House .
- Spolsky, B. and R. L. Cooper 1991. *The Languages of Jerusalem*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tajfel, H., ed. 1982a. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, D. M. and D. J. McKirnan 1984. A five stage model of intergroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 23: 291-300.
- Weinreich, P. 2000. Ethnic Identity and Acculturation: Ethnic Stereotyping and Identification, Self Esteem and Identity Diffusion in a Multicultural Context. In: Elie Olshtain and G. Horenczyk, eds. *Language, Identity and Immigration*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.

Annjo K. Greenall: To translate or not to translate: Attitudes to English loanwords in Norwegian
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
212-226
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Annjo K. Greenall and the Editors, 2005

To translate or not to translate: Attitudes to English loanwords in Norwegian

Annjo K. Greenall

*Department of Modern Languages, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Trondheim, Norway
ann.j.k.greenall@hf.ntnu.no*

Abstract

The ‘fast forward’ button for the influx of English loanwords¹ into the Scandinavian languages has long since been pressed. The views on this phenomenon, both in academic and non-academic circles, can generally be divided into two categories. On the one hand, there are those who are more or less strongly concerned about the ‘pollution’ and possible future eradication of their language (these possibly constitute a majority, at least among Norwegian academics), and on the other there are those who do not seem to mind so much that English seems to be claiming some territory within their language. In this paper, I look at some material which illustrates the nature of this divide particularly well. The material stems from a Norwegian discussion list on the web (Ordlabben/‘The Word Lab’)², where people are invited to contribute suitable Norwegian translations for a set of recent English loanwords. I focus especially on a subset of these contributions, where the contributors, rather than straightforwardly accepting the task they are invited to perform, show fierce opposition to this proposed strategy of Norwegianization, thereby showing a *positive* attitude towards the influx of English loanwords into the Norwegian language. After presenting the material I discuss, mainly from the perspective of Bakhtinian dialogism, whether or not there exists a defence for this kind of attitude, and whether indeed such a defence ought to be considered at all, in light of the fact that the prevailing opinion within academic and policy-making circles seems to be that people representing this kind of attitude need to be ‘protected from themselves’.

Attitudes to English loanwords in Denmark, Sweden and Norway

In Denmark, Pia Jarvad conducted a study on the attitudes of Danes to English loanwords in Danish, and found that 75% of the participants felt that it was OK to use English words like *shorts*, *sweater*, *weekend*, *carport*, *sandwich*, etc.; only 4% characterized speech containing such words as ‘bad language’ (1995:123). The numbers were less definite when it came to more recent, complex expressions (such as *you name it*, *take it or leave it*, *point of no return*, *the real thing*, *the seat of the nineties*, *second to none*, etc.); here, as many as 56% felt that it was OK to use such idioms, whereas 35% did not (125). Nevertheless, the general conclusion was that

¹ I am aware of the widespread doubt regarding the appropriateness of the term ‘loanword’ vis-à-vis the phenomenon it is the label for. I nevertheless choose to use it, among other things because I have yet to come across a better term.

² <http://www.dagbladet.no/kunnskap/ordlabben/>

attitudes to English loanwords were rather relaxed. In Sweden, the results were quite different: Maria Wingstedt's survey of "ideologies of language in Sweden" (1998:159) revealed that 66% of Swedes felt that Swedish should be kept as pure as possible (259). It is also revelatory that as many as 23% of the Swedes who participated in the survey believed that Swedish might be a dead language in 100 years (261).

Inger-Lise Masvie conducted a similar survey among teenagers and young adults in Norway. One significant finding here, was the large number of respondents who had no opinion on the issue of English loanwords in Norwegian (42%). Apart from that, the number of negative responses (39%) outweighed the number of positive ones (19%) (1992:46). Contrary to the study by Jarvad (above), which did not reveal many differences in attitude across sociolinguistic parameters such as region and social group, Masvie's study showed a clear pattern: teenagers are more positive to English loanwords than adults, men are more positive than women, and people from Oslo are more positive than people from Farsund (a regional town in southern Norway) (46).

The material

The present material, rather than adding more and more updated statistics to work such as that carried out by Masvie, rather serves to illustrate and fill in information about the *exact content and nature* of the attitudes that find themselves on either side of the attested *yes/no* divide. This is, in part, because the material – which consists of contributions made to a Norwegian Internet discussion list (Ordlabben/'The Word Lab') – does not easily lend itself to statistical analysis: it does not give reliable information about respondents and it is open-ended: as I am writing this, the number of contributions is still growing, and will continue to do so until it is removed from the web. Thus, the material's value first and foremost derives from the fact that it consists of volunteered, spontaneous, sometimes quite lengthy statements which reveal various kinds of attitude to English loanwords in Norwegian.


The Word Lab came about as a joint effort between the Norwegian Language Council (NLC),³ which is the Norwegian government's advisory body for matters pertaining to the Norwegian language, and *Dagbladet*, one of Norway's biggest tabloid newspapers. The NLC, being the appointed watchdog for the Norwegian language, takes – as expected – a negative stand to the issue of English loanwords. This, presumably, forms at least part of their motivation for participating in maintaining The Word Lab, since what happens here, is that people (people 'in general'⁴) are invited to take part in a process of Norwegianizing, i.e., trying to find Norwegian equivalents to, some (relatively recent) English loanwords, e.g.,

Date, zipoffbukse, stayer, paintball, kiteboarding, dreadlocks/dreads, trick or treat, Halloween, nuggets, wide-screen, hat-trick, wannabe, fastfood, event, campus, art director, tights, reality-TV, flight, chatte, offroader, eye-liner, happy hour, audition, workshop, street cred, roller blades, image, bake-off, smoothies, performance-kunst, hacker, cracker, backstage, ghostwriter, downlight, body, breakdown, trainee, joystick, catwalk, turnover, walkover.

The contributors are asked to provide a translation for any of these (and more) words, and in addition, they are asked to justify their choices (see sample dialogue box below):

³ <http://www.sprakrad.no>

⁴ The NLC and *Dagbladet* also run an email discussion list which invites council members, students and academics from relevant fields, media workers and other interested parties to contribute translations of English loanwords (Ordsmia/'The Wordsmithy').



It is a reasonable hypothesis that what the NLC is hoping to achieve by means of this and similar initiatives is increased positivity to their attempts at Norwegianizing English loanwords. Many of the NLC's 'purifying' initiatives in the past⁵ have failed, possibly because the Council has attempted to implement changes in what has been perceived as a one-way, dictatorial fashion. By contrast, the Word Lab emerges as an attempt to stimulate an open, participatory atmosphere. And the response has indeed been quite impressive. For some of the loanwords that have been introduced on the list, the number of contributions is as high as 60 or 70. The average number of contributions, however, is probably around 20-30 per word.

This is not, however, to say, that the contributions have always been of the desired kind (at least from the perspective of the NLC). On the one hand, there are a number of more or less straightforward contributions from people who seem to unproblematically accept the invitation to translate loanwords into Norwegian. These contributors delve headlong into the task, whether it be out of a genuine wish to contribute, or out of a seemingly innocent wish to be funny and draw attention to themselves. On the other hand, however, there is a group of contributors who, rather than accepting the invitation, seize the opportunity to argue fiercely *against* the notion that one should translate English loanwords into Norwegian. In the following I call these people 'rebels', not because I want to somehow 'romanticize' their point of view, but rather, firstly, because of their status as a minority on the list (and perhaps also in real life, cf. Masvie's study above), secondly, because of the rather severe political incorrectness – in a Norwegian context – of their views, thirdly, because of the resultant defensive tone of the responses, and finally, because of their archetypal, overt challenge to a powerful 'enemy', namely the NLC.

⁵ E.g. their proposals to Norwegianize the spelling of established English loanwords (some examples: *køntri* (country, as in *country & western*), *pøbb* (pub), *gaid* (guide)).

In the following section, I give some examples of typical responses of both kinds, and draw attention to some of their most typical characteristics. I should like to emphasize that I know next to nothing about who the respondents are; I have made no attempt to contact the respondents via the (possibly not genuine) email-addresses that appear together with their messages (see above), quite simply because I am mainly interested in assessing the general nature of the debate, and not in distinguishing trends according to sociolinguistic parameters. Thus, ‘people in general’ is as close to an identification of the group of subjects as it is possible to come in this case, although the debate must be said to be characterized by a young tone.

Serious, non-serious, and rebellious contributions

So far, I have been talking about one division line and two main categories of response, although it is obviously not as simple as that. I have, for instance, already briefly mentioned a group of people who seem to respond to the invitation to translate English loanwords in positive terms, but who do not seem to take the assigned task seriously. In the following, I situate this category of response *between* the straightforward, ‘serious’ responses and the rebel responses, since it is indeed a borderline category: it is close to impossible to assess, merely on the basis of what is given in the responses, whether these people are just indifferent to the implicit issue (*yes/no* to English loanwords in Norwegian), or whether they rather constitute a class of good-natured rebels.

A typical ‘distribution of numerical power’ between these three categories – serious, non-serious and rebellious contributions – is for the first to be in the lead, the second not far behind, and the third constituting a minority. For the word *zipoffbukse*⁶, for example, there were 33 responses all in all. 13 of these were clear-cut serious responses; 15 were non-serious/hard to determine, the remaining five were rebel responses.⁷

In the following, I look at some of the contributions pertaining to *zipoffbukse* from each of the three categories. Later on, I also look at some contributions pertaining some of the other loanwords, but only with respect to the rebel category. For each example, I provide a ‘loose’ English translation, both for the translation proposal (when there is one) and for the justification.

Serious contributions

Proposal: Vårbukse

‘*Spring trousers*’

Justification: For om våren er det ofte kaldt først på dagen og så blir det varmt og da kan du ta av beina på buksa omtrent samtidig som du tar av genseren . . .

‘*Because in the spring it is often cold early in the day and then it gets warm and then you can take the legs off the trousers at the same time as taking off your sweater . . .*’

This is quite typical of serious proposals. The respondent basically does as he or she is asked. If we were to judge the quality of the proposal, however, we would probably find that it flouts several of the rules regarding how to put together a good loanword equivalent (cf. Sandøy

⁶ A compound with both English and Norwegian elements denoting a pair of trousers where the bottom part of the leg is attached with a zip and comes off.

⁷ As the list proceeds, with more and more new words for people to translate, it becomes apparent that the rebels have not managed to disrupt and derail the discussion in the way they had perhaps hoped, so the percentage of rebel responses drops even lower. As for words introduced at a relatively late stage, we get hardly any rebel responses at all, something which further emphasizes the minority status of this group.

2000:243ff). Among other things, it is not quite true to fact, since it implies that the trousers are not suitable for summer use. At least with the summers we have in certain parts of Norway, one would normally be grateful for an extra length of leg to zip on when needed.

Proposal: Todelsbukse

'Two-part trousers'

Justification: Eller var det tredels?

'Or was it three-part?'

Again, the contributor tries, and manages, to make a decent go of it. This example demonstrates, however, the typical trend of using the justification-field in a slightly 'naughty' way, i.e. not strictly in order to justify the choice of Norwegian equivalent, but rather to try to create an amusing, entertaining effect.

Proposal: "wannabeshorts" bukse

"wannabeshorts" trousers'

Justification: Her har du ei bukse som ikke helt vet hva den vil være . . . Lang eller kort, så den er delt på midten!

'Here you have some trousers which don't really know what they want to be . . . Long or short, so they're split in the middle!'

Sometimes it is hard to tell whether a proposal belongs to the serious or non-serious category. This is an example of such a case. Here, like in quite a few other places in the material, the respondent replaces one English loanword with another, which is patently not what the list organizers intended. However, because the use of English in creating neologisms in Norwegian is so common, it is difficult to know for certain whether the respondent is actually aware that he or she is doing this, and that it is 'wrong' in relation to the list managers' intentions. After all, the justification of the choice seems serious enough.

Non-serious contributions

Proposal: Bukse for dverger og normale

'Trousers for dwarves and normal people'

Justification: Og visste du at . . . Hei, visste du at det er større sannsynlighet for å bli slått av lyn enn å bli spist av hai?

'And did you know that . . . Hey, did you know that there is a greater probability that you will get struck by lightning than get eaten by sharks?'

Rather than a borderline case, there are several traits that single this proposal out as a clear-cut non-serious one. The translation is for a start unnecessarily cumbersome, a rather heavy noun phrase rather than the expected word. Then there is the use of the slightly derogatory word *dwarf*; and, finally, the justification for the translation constitutes, of course, a complete irrelevancy. This respondent is clearly not trying to contribute to Norwegianization, but on the other hand, he or she cannot really be said to be trying to cause any serious disruption, either.

Rebel contributions

The following responses to *zipoffbukse*, however, clearly are. The opinions of the representatives of the rebel group are – for the most part – crystal clear: keep the word as it is, don't try to

Norwegianize it. The ways in which these opinions are expressed range from the extremely brief and to-the-point, to the extremely verbose. The first example is of the former kind:

Proposal: dere er alle teite!!

'you are all stupid!!'

Justification: Som gidder å diskutere dette!!!!!!!!!!!!

'For even being bothered to discuss this!!!!!!!!!!!!'

This example is in fact ambiguous. The contribution could either mean 'there are so many *important* things to discuss, why do you waste your time on this, very *unimportant* issue?', in which case it is not a rebel response of the type we are after here, or it could mean 'you are all stupid in taking this enterprise seriously because *Norwegianization* is stupid', in which case it would be a true rebel response. Taken in the latter sense, the contribution is typical of rebel contributions in two main respects: on the one hand, it uses derogatory language (*stupid*), and on the other, there is an excessive use of punctuation, both of which signal strong involvement and create a rather aggressive tone. We shall see much more of this in upcoming examples.

Proposal: Zipoffbukse

'Zip-off trousers'

Justification: Hva er vitsen med å absolutt ha norske navn på alt??? Et produkt navn er et produktnavn. Hva blir det neste at Liu, Ahmed og Ali ikke har godkjente navn, hva med Kari, Ole og Per? . . .

'What's the point in insisting on having Norwegian names for everything??? A product name is a product name. What will be next, that Liu, Ahmed and Ali don't have accepted names, how about Kari, Ole and Per? . . . '

What this contribution exemplifies, is the typical tendency of rebel responses to just repeat the word in its original form in the proposal-field, signalling the desire of the contributor that the word should simply be *kept* in its original form. The justification-field also contains a number of recurring features: 1. It is quite wordy (although not as wordy as many of the other rebel responses), indicating strength of involvement. 2. It has an initial, obviously heartfelt statement 'What's the point in insisting on having Norwegian names for everything'. The exasperated – 'at-one's-wits'-end' – quality of this statement is seen over and over again in this kind of response. 3. The argument that follows the initial statement can be found in two of the five rebel responses for *zipoffbukse*: the respondent feels that a product name is akin to a person's first name in the sense that both are somehow inextricably tied to the identity of the product/person. Thus, changing the name of the product, the argument goes, would be as meaningless as asking a foreign person in Norway to change *their* name to a typical Norwegian name, such as Kari, Ole or Per. We may note here that the names used to exemplify typical Norwegian names are very traditional ones, and ones that are considered to be a bit 'farmish'. This might indicate that the respondent feels that foreign is cool and urban, whilst Norwegian is uncool and rural – an attitude which is found in many of the replies, e.g. the following, which is a response to a different loanword, i.e. *stayer*:

Proposal: Til Trak Tor (fortsettelse fra innelegg 1)

'To Trak Tor (continuation of contribution no. 1)'

Justification: Det er klart jeg har medfølelse for fremmedgjøringen og identitetskrisen føler når du humper rundt på traktoren din i frykt for neste møte med framskrittet i form av en engelsk film uten undertekst, et operativsystem som ikke er på norsk eller ei engelsktalende dame du med gebrokkent engelsk prøver å lure med i høyet men som straks avslører deg for den lille

uinformerte bygdegrisen du er da du verbalt kommer til kort. Men det er greit det, behold norsken din du, fornorsk gjerne hvert eneste utenlandske ord som kommer inn i synsfeltet ditt, men den dagen ungene dine på uforståelig vis babler i vei med pleierne på sykehjemmet som da har blitt din faste adresse, er det ikke sikkert det er seniliteten som har tatt det siste avgjørende jafset av språksenteret ditt, du er simpelthen bare for norsk :)

'Of course I sympathize with the alienation and identity crisis you feel when you jolt around on your tractor in fear of your next encounter with progress in the form of an English film without subtitles, an operating system which isn't in Norwegian or an English speaking bird who you, in broken English, try to trick into sleeping with you in the hay but who immediately blows your cover, seeing you for the insignificant, uninformed little farm-pig that you are when you verbally can't hack it. But that's fine, just keep your Norwegian, feel free to Norwegianize every single foreign word that enters your field of vision, but the day when your kids, in a way not understandable to you, babble away with the nurses in the nursing home which by then has become your permanent address, it is not certain that it is dementia which has taken the last, definite bite off your language centre, you are quite simply too Norwegian :)'

This response differs from the others considered so far in being a reply to somebody on the list, rather than a direct response to the invitation to translate a loanword. It is similar, however, in promoting – in a much more aggressive way than in the previous example – the message that Abroad (especially Anglo-America) is cool, whereas Norway, and especially regional Norway, is uncool.

Returning to the word *zipoffbukse*, we see that in one of the remaining rebel responses, a further aspect is added to the above line of argumentation:

Proposal: *zipoffbukse*

'zip-off trousers'

Justification: hvorfor i all verden skal vi fornorske alt hallo. problemet til nordmenn er at vi svært sjelden produsere noen ting og eksporterer det derfor føler vi at det norske språk ikke brukes er helt utmerket jeg vil fortsatt like å bli kalt hva jeg heter selv om jeg er i utlandet, oiit det ble kanskje litt sterkt . . .

'why on earth should we norwegianize everything I'm sorry. the problem of Norwegians is that we very rarely produce anything and export it and therefore we feel that the Norwegian language isn't used is utterly brilliant I'd still like to be called by what is my name even though I'm abroad, whoooooops this is perhaps a bit too strong(ly put) . . . '

Here, the respondent displays (implicit?) knowledge of a well-known phenomenon, namely that many English loanwords come to other countries as part and parcel of new products. The respondent then uses this insight to construct an argument to the effect that the whole Norwegianization business is just a result of Norwegians being envious because they do not have any products that could piggyback *their* language out to the world. Or, in other words, we would do the same thing if we only had the chance, so why be so hypocritical . . . The main point of interest here, however, is the final comment: 'whoops this is perhaps a bit too strong(ly put)'. This utterance refers to the fear of being met by sanctions if one expresses this kind of politically incorrect view, and is hence a symptom of the fact that there *is* a battle going on, and that there are real blows to be struck.

Moving on now to a couple of other loanword prompts, we shall see that this aspect of the argumentation is even further developed in some other responses, in the sense that the respondents' positioning vis-à-vis the 'enemy' is becoming clearer:

Wannabe

Proposal: Wannabe . . .

Justification: NEI!!! Ikke la ?språknissene? sitte å konstruere kunstige ord, språk er et kommunikasjonsverktøy og er i så måte dynamisk og utvikler seg i takt med tiden vi lever i og behovet vi har for kontakt med andre mennesker. Så ikke bruk resurser på å lage kunstige og fjollete ord, men la språket utvikle seg naturlig. Det går helt fint uten såkalt eksperthjelp! Og jeg bare spør, hva er Norsk? Nei, slutt å tøve med dette! Hilsen en som bruker vårt språk, og andre, som et kommunikasjonsverktøy! Jeg synes de som jobber i språkrådet kanskje burde finne andre ting å gjøre, begynne å skape virkelige verdier! ;-) mvh, ?ikke språkexpert? :-)

'NO!!! Don't let the ?language gnomes? make up artificial words, language is a tool for communication and in this respect is dynamic and develops in pace with the times we live in and the need we have for contact with other people. So don't waste resources on making artificial and silly words, rather let the language develop naturally. We are fine without so-called expert help! And I ask: what is Norwegian? Stop messing about! Greetings from someone who uses our language, and other languages, as a tool for communication! I think the people who work in the Language Council should look for something else to do, start creating real values! ;-) friendly greetings, ?not-a-language-expert? ;-)'

What we see here, is that the contributor takes a daring step further, actually *explicitly referring to the enemy*, first in terms of a metaphor: they are 'language gnomes' (who 'waste resources on making artificial and silly words', rather than letting the 'language develop naturally'). At the very bottom of the message the name is finally revealed, and, lo and behold, it is the NLC. Their activities are superfluous and 'silly', according to this contributor, because if only the tool for communication that is language is left alone, it will evolve 'dynamically' and in a perfectly satisfactory way. The implication seems to be that the enemy is seeing language for 'more' than what it really is ('more' than merely an instrument of communication), building values into the notion of language (revolving around its role in society and in individuals' lives?), which are quite simply not warranted – a view which is not too far removed from that of proponents of certain mainstream branches of linguistics, in fact!

Joystick

Proposal: Morostake . . . Styrepinne . . . NÅ HAR NORSK SPRÅKRÅD DRITI SEG UT . . .

'Funstick . . . Steering stick . . . NOW THE NORWEGIAN LANGUAGE COUNCIL HAVE REALLY MADE ASSES OF THEMSELVES . . . '

Justification: Altså . . . Internasjonalisering er nødvendig dersom Norge skal klare å følge med i verden . . . (for guds skyld, drit i de anglikanske uttrykkene) Og nynorsken . . . er så enig . . . kast den på søppeldynga. Hvorfor i faen skal vi lære et mål som en dust gikk rundt å samla ord til for 100 år siden . . . Alle skulle ha snakka engelsk – misforståelse = krig, forståelse = fred . . . Om vi alle kunne kommunisert med hverandre hadde verden vært et enklere sted. Go fast everyone . . . Live your life and smile to the world . . . Hilsen opprørt jævel fra Oslo . . .

'Let's see . . . Internationalization is necessary if Norway is to be able to keep up with the world . . . (for goodness sake, forget about those Anglican expressions) And nynorsken (one of Norway's two official written standards, based on the Norwegian dialects, compiled by the philologist Ivar Aasen in the 19th century) . . . I couldn't agree more . . . throw it on the rubbish heap. Why the hell should we have to learn a language which some fool went around collecting words for a 100 years ago . . . Everybody should speak English - misunderstandings = war, understanding = peace . . . If we all were able to communicate with one another, the world

would be a simpler place. Go fast everyone . . . Live your life and smile to the world . . . ⁸
Greetings from a pissed-off bastard from Oslo . . . ‘

Here, the positioning vis-à-vis the NLC is even clearer (cf., e.g., the capital letters used when referring to the Council in the proposal field, capital letters signalling ‘shouting’ in email and SMS varieties), and the ill-feelings expressed are, if possible, even more acrid (cf., e.g., the heavy use of derogatory language in the proposal field and elsewhere in the text). Also present is an extensive display of the typical downgrading of the national and an upgrading of the international, but with the interesting addition of the so-called ‘technocratic’ approach (see Sandøy 2000:181): if only languages became more alike, the respondent claims, we would understand one another better and hence we would be able to create a better world. This opinion would perhaps have been more edible to the intellectual elite if it had not been for the fact that languages seem to be becoming more alike in terms of becoming more like one single language, that language being unpalatable to them: English.

A defence for the rebel responses?

At the outset, I promised that I would try to raise a defence for the opinions of these rebels. Two obvious questions emanate from this resolve. Firstly, is there really a *need* for such a defence? These people are ‘rebels with a cause’ who moreover seem to be more than capable of speaking for themselves, and besides, their opinions are perfectly in accord with the way things are going anyway. Secondly, and more importantly, however: is raising such a defence at all a responsible thing to do, insofar as the threat to linguistic diversity – an unquestionable value – is serious enough as it is? Why add fuel to the fire by recognizing such opinions as those voiced by these rebels?

As regards the first of these questions, I would like to make the claim that contrary to popular (or should I say academic) opinion, the groups representing rebel attitudes are *not* necessarily a strong group. There are two main reasons for this. For a start, in Norway, their ‘enemy’ is an elite of academics and politicians; the rebels have few, if any, representatives or spokespeople within this club, insofar as adopting a position which would in any way support ‘rebel opinion’ within Norwegian academia today is a risky affair. Secondly, as I have pointed out before, Masvie’s (1992) study, and the relatively low numbers of rebels participating in the list (in comparison with the number of ‘conformers’), seem to suggest that they constitute a minority. The result of both of these situations has been a considerable suppression of the rebels’ views. To an extent, the Word Lab came in and changed all that, in providing the rebels with a welcome outlet for their opinions. At last, there was a chance to be heard, and paradoxically, it was the ‘enemy’ who (inadvertently) provided the opportunity.

The relative weakness of this group is also reflected in the tone of the responses. Long-term suppression of opinion and the fact that the present opinion-voicing goes on behind enemy lines causes unmistakable aggression, which, unfortunately for the rebels, makes it all too easy to dismiss their responses as childish and unserious, and to see them as perfect illustrations of why ‘folk linguistics’, “folk-beliefs”, ought to continue to be regarded as “unscientific and worthy only of disdain” (Niedzielski & Preston 2000:3). Nobody has, to my knowledge, paused to ask themselves the question whether the rebels’ defensiveness, sometimes bordering on desperation, could not be anchored in some form of justifiable experience.

⁸ The non-italicized portions of the text are in ‘English’ (Norwegian-English) in the original.

As regards the second question posed above – is it *responsible* to try to raise a defence for the ‘rebels’ – it should, for a start, be clear that it would definitely be irresponsible to continue to *suppress* their views, regardless of one’s own opinions on the matter. Secondly, however, I show in the following that the question is hardly valid in this particular case, insofar as the underlying, generally accepted ‘truth’ that it builds on – that if the influx of loanwords into a language becomes too overwhelming, then this will engulf the language (and hence culture) in question – is tenuous. This view, which in itself goes a long way to justifying the rebels’ opinion that the road to linguistic happiness does not necessarily go via the translation of English loanwords, is rendered plausible, in the following, by reference to some of the ideas of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, which show *how* and *why* (rather than just *that*) loanwords do not change (in a transitive sense), as much as they are *themselves* changed in the process of borrowing.

This will be my first move in this game of devil’s advocate. The second move will consist in trying to find a justification for the ‘internationalist’, ‘technocratic’ aspects of the rebels’ argumentation. Here, I will draw on some suggestions made by the Danish literary researcher Frederik Thygstrup, which, amalgamated with the present perspective, produce the conclusion that loanwords are not *just* little missiles of cultural imperialism (although this aspect *is* clearly present), being also quite willingly-chosen air holes punctuating a potentially oppressive regional operational ground.

The Bakhtinian perspective

Despite a growing consensus among sociolinguists that the influx of loanwords is probably not the greatest threat to the survival of a small language,⁹ there still seems to be a large residue of opinion that if such an influx should become too overwhelming, then this would threaten to engulf the language in question. And not only that; since language is also generally seen to (somehow) carry culture, then it is not just the *language* which will become engulfed and finally extinct, but also all of the target culture.

The so-called dialogism of Mikhail Bakhtin (e.g. 1981, 1986) and the Bakhtin circle gives us the tools to show how this is not necessarily what happens (and also that *if* it happens, it is not necessarily because of borrowing). Because according to a dialogistic perspective, a word is not a static entity with a fixed (in the present case, foreign) identity which by its very emergence will necessarily push a lesser used target equivalent over the ‘edge’ into oblivion. Rather, a word is a dynamic, highly adjustable entity which displays a relatively low degree of loyalty to its origins, and which therefore quickly finds a home within its new contexts, co-existing quite happily with its neighbours.

To start, however, from the beginning, let us first take a look at the traditional, Cartesian, linguistic thinking in relation to word meaning. Generally speaking, within this paradigm, words are regarded as entities whose forms are ‘walled’ vessels which safeguard a reservoir of alternative meanings which, because of their containment within this vessel, can be relatively easily grasped, described and circumscribed. Under this perspective, meanings are properties of the *form* of the word. More recently, of course, emphasis has been shifted from meaning as a property of form, to meaning as a property of the entity that is seen to embody that form, namely the individual mind.

⁹ In an attempt at solving one problem by exaggerating another, the role of main threat has recently been shifted over to domain loss (e.g. Mæhlum 2000).

It is quite clear that this way of looking at word meaning does not efficiently accommodate the well-known phenomenon that loanwords seem to become gradually adjusted to the host language, both in terms of form, function, and meaning (e.g. Johansson & Graedler 2002:18-19). For instance, the first part of the English expression *rock'n roll* – *rock* – has, since the borrowing of the expression into the Norwegian language, assumed a new form (the adjective-forming suffix *-a* has been added to it, to produce *rocka*), and a new use, as a description of a visual style and/or attitude suited to the rock'n roll life-style (e.g. *ei rocka dame*: a girl/woman sporting a look associated with the rock'n roll life-style, and/or with a behaviour or attitude of somebody 'into' the rock'n roll life-style). The point is, that if you were to try to use *rocka* vis-à-vis a native speaker of English, or even an 'anglified' version of it (**rocky*; **a rocky lady*), you would no doubt raise quite a few eyebrows. Somehow the word is no longer English. The question is, of course, whether it therefore has necessarily become Norwegian.

The observation that loanwords somewhere down the line somehow lose their original identity and acquire a new one is not well catered for within a framework which assumes a static and inflexible relationship between a word and its meaning. What we need, then, is a theory, which, like dialogism, assumes that words and meanings arise and develop in social – dialogical – interaction, in a dynamic, sometimes unpredictable fashion. In fact, and in stark contrast to traditional linguistic thinking, words are, in dialogism, not seen to 'have' meanings at all. Rather, words can, from this perspective, be seen to provide some highly elastic anchorage to meaning *potentials* (Voloshinov 1973:79ff), which could be described as loosely consistent associative networks with no real beginning and no real end. When a word is deployed in context, certain aspects of this meaning potential are *actualized*, and it is precisely – and only – in the relation between this context and the given meaning potential that meaning 'proper' is seen to arise, exist, or alternatively, take place. The most important point for the present purposes, however, is that this actualization process is *not* a neutral process where context merely 'highlights' a (predictable) aspect of a word's meaning potential. There is a rather more profound process of mutual influence going on. When meaning elements of the context and meaning elements from the meaning potential come into contact with one another, none remain unaffected. Thus, each time a word is used in a new context, its meaning potential is – at the very least on a micro-level – somehow affected: the organization of elements within the associative network may change slightly, there may be additions to the meaning potential (the word gains new meanings and/or areas of use), or subtractions (the word *loses* old meanings). In principle, each and every context a word is used in, *contributes something new to the meaning potential of that word*. Furthermore, this is a process that never finishes. A word is never 'finished' (Voloshinov 1973:79ff, Linell 1996:7:205-206, Greenall 2002:234ff).

And here we are, of course, at the heart of the matter. If we trace the history of an English loanword – any loanword, really – according to this theory, the word would start life, obviously, as a word of the English language; it would evolve as an element of the English language through insertion into an innumerable number of contexts, adapting and adjusting, becoming an inextricable part of the language and through this an equally inextricable part of its users' culture and identity. One day, however, the word becomes 'copied' into a completely different language, thereby starting a journey through a number of *foreign* contexts, each putting its thumbprint on the word, to the point where the word is hardly recognizable in any of its original contexts. And the word continues its journey forever, the relative distance between the two languages and cultures ensuring that the difference continues to grow. After a while, there is hardly anything left of the word's original meaning potential, it has been eroded away by the constant 'rubbing' against target language contexts. At this point, nobody, not even the most hard-headed purist, will flinch at the sight of the word; it has become 'Norwegian'.

As an example of this, consider the fact that in the middle ages, e.g., Old Norse in Norway experienced an influx of words and grammatical structures from low German, because of Hanseatic activity on the West Coast. Practically overnight, Old Norse changed from a form which we, today, as modern Norwegians, cannot understand at all, to a form which is relatively understandable to a speaker of modern Norwegian (e.g. Johnsen 1987:54-55). In all likelihood, many people found this problematic to cope with at the time. Today, however, there is nothing about this heritage which shouts 'German' to the average user, and the Norwegian language is as Norwegian as it ever was, to all of its speakers.

Everything that has been said so far points towards the conclusion that the postulated threat is a *perceived*, and not an *objective* threat (Haberland 1997:4): what we are facing is *not* engulfment. Change, absolutely, but nothing like the predicted case of linguistic or cultural hijacking. One remaining worry is perhaps the unprecedented speed at which the current process of adoption of English loanwords is taking place; at the present time there is no way of knowing for certain what sort of impact this will have. But if it is the case that the dialogical process of contextual influence on meaning potentials will, as I believe it will, always ensure adaptation and evolution in the direction of an 'indigenous' identity for the originally foreign word, then the arguments against English loanwords merely become a matter of purism for purism's sake, and the rebels will have been avenged. Because if the process of accepting loanwords into the language is not a process of linguistic and cultural enslavement, but rather just an ordinary process of linguistic and cultural change which will in fact safeguard diversity, then their opinion will have gained a considerable amount of legitimacy.

Home and away

So far, I have been considering the possible justification of the general project proposed by the rebels, that we should *not* translate English loanwords. In the final part of this paper, I have a look at their main *argument* which, loosely rephrased, consists in the claim that the reason we should not reject English loanwords is because we need English in order to be able to somehow connect with the outer world (ultimately in order to do our 'bit' in the bid for world peace, so to speak).

Some would perhaps say that this is too kind a rendering of their argument, since it mostly takes the form of 'slagging off' Norway as rural, naïve, and uncool, whereas the international (Anglo-American?) arena is glorified as its counterpart: urban, streetwise and cool. The Norwegian Language Council, in the rebel responses, actually emerges as a *symbol* of the former; their representatives are seen as embodiments of home-grown, ingrown attitudes. They are '*språknisser*' (a *nisse* is a short, stout, mythical creature associated with farming communities and rural areas in general). Moreover, the NLC also has the perceived power to *impose* their attitudes on everybody else. Thus, they come to represent everything that is narrow and limiting about home. In this picture, English (in Norwegian, or in itself), emerges as a 'saviour', a life-saving, soul-saving link to the greater, international community.

This, to me, echoes a point made by the Danish literary researcher Frederik Thygstrup in the course of a debate at a recent conference on globalization at NTNU,¹⁰ Trondheim. The backdrop to his point is this: in the globalization debate, one strong line of conjecture is that the national level as a provider of identity is gradually losing importance by comparison with the global and

¹⁰ Norwegian University of Science and Technology. The conference was held in May 2003.

local levels. In addition, there has been a strong feeling that the global is imposing on the local, *dominating* it. Thygstrup's point was, I believe, that it is possible to look at this picture slightly differently. Rather than a one-way situation where the strong dominates the weak, what we may well be faced with, according to Thygstrup, is a situation where the local arena becomes a cultural meeting place, an arena for the (dialogical?) *exchange of culture*. This is well in line with the fact – evidenced to an overwhelming degree in the Word Lab, in fact – that both on the linguistic and cultural levels, the so-called linguistic impositions are actually often invited or warmly welcomed (i.e., if English is a killer language, then some people are clearly suicidal). Brit Mæhlum, in an article on domain loss for Norwegian, uses the notion of “*avmaktens optimisme*” (2002:131) (borrowed from the Finnish philosopher Georg Henrik von Wright), translatable into English as ‘the optimism of powerlessness’, to characterize the positive reception of the emergence of a dominating language on the national scene. Under this interpretation, people (e.g. the rebels), knowing that they have no choice but to accept their fate (e.g. the taking over of Norwegian by English loanwords), will choose to cheerfully give in to circumstances that they cannot control, *because* they cannot control them. This kind of effect exists, I am sure, but I am rather doubtful of its applicability here, insofar as the rebels seem neither full of optimism nor of cheerfulness: on the contrary, there is every indication that they feel like they are on the losing end of a battle, *not* vis-à-vis a development they cannot control, but rather vis-à-vis forces that are working to *stall* this development. Or, in other words, in the rebel's mind, the fate is not unavoidable at all, and those who are opposed to the development may well win.

Returning to, and looking further into, Thygstrup's point (that the influence is not one-way (dominating > dominee) but rather two-way), we see that rather than the predicted *homogenization* of a target culture, what we may have on our hands is equally likely a *hybridization* of cultures, a process which may well constitute – and this is Thygstrup's expression – a ‘civilizing influence’ on local communities, since such communities can often be rather repressive in nature.¹¹ Knowledge that things can be done in a different way may have the effect of keeping a valuable check on repressive forces, and the actual adoption of new perspectives and customs may of course have an even more strongly liberating function. As far as language is concerned, there has also been a predicted homogenization, but here, too, as we saw in the previous section, the notion of hybridization may be more fitting. It is not necessarily a question of a brutal take-over. Looking at the available evidence, the process seems much more amenable to a description in terms of a gentle mix and subsequent absorption, with an end-product that is different from both points of departure, but always with a distinct indigenous identity.

We cannot quite let go of this point, however, without also noting that this kind of hybridization seems to go hand in hand with the establishment of ‘ghettos’ by those who feel that the ‘air-holes’ provided by foreign loan words and the increasing acceptance of English into everyday life do not provide *enough* ventilation, and who therefore (and for other reasons, of course) gather together in enclaves where one or more aspects of the foreign culture are embraced particularly enthusiastically. Such groups most often gather around some sort of activity or special interest, such as, e.g., skateboarding, snowboarding, kiteboarding, rollerblading, paintballing, and so on; and typical of most of them is that the terminology which defines the group and the activity that the group gathers around consists of untranslated English loanwords, often in a relatively non-adapted form (cf. Preisler 1999). I would actually not be surprised if it

¹¹ A good example of this is provided in the Swedish film *Fucking Åmål* by Lukas Moodysson, which describes the falling in love of two lesbian girls in a small, dull Swedish town called Åmål.

turned out, upon further scrutiny, that some of the rebels of the Word Lab have ties to some such subgroup. And if they do, the reason for their frustration and anger becomes even more clear: to take away their words, like the NLC proposes to do, would amount to removing their air-holes, their deliberately chosen breathing space, where they can escape and be themselves without controlling influences that try to keep them in their place. Furthermore, since loanwords so quickly become a natural part of the linguistic environment that they are used in, and since this environment plays a large role in shaping people's identities, to take away their words would also mean to take away part of their identity.

Concluding remarks

In conclusion, what I have tried to show is that it ought to be possible to look at the rebels' position and argumentation with more sympathetic eyes than what is normally the case: if we manage to look beyond the underlying 'vulgar-evolutionary' attitude that one might suspect lies behind their contributions to the Word Lab discussion list, an alternative picture emerges, that of a defensive group at their wits' end, driven to desperation by an uncomprehending elite trying to deprive them of important portholes which enable them to catch a glimpse of a bigger reality, portholes that they have come to rely on to the extent that the view beyond them has become part of their identity. If this picture is too one-sided, then the regular picture – that of the rebels as ignorant bullies – is equally one-sided, and in any case it is clear to me that nobody benefits from the suppression of an entire side of a coin.

Makers of language policy tend to be influenced by individuals who in their eagerness to protect the rights of speakers of small languages tend to overlook the crucial fact that these are not a homogenous group. Whether or not the rebels constitute a minority is, as I have said before, an open question; however, their mere existence ought perhaps to be a good argument in favour of turning the question of the rights of speakers of small languages into a question of *whose* rights. Another important question to consider is who empowers whom in this game of postulating what constitutes a 'right', and exactly what these rights (ought to) consist in. For some, their current definition results in 'protection' from something they actually desire, from something that they feel that they are voluntarily choosing, and hence the right ceases to be a right and becomes a rule. And if you want to know how that feels, just ask 'a pissed-off bastard from Oslo'.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist, edited by Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Translated by Vernon McGee, edited by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Greenall, Ann Jorid Klungervik 2002. *Towards a socio-cognitive account of flouting and flout-based meaning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Haberland, Hartmut 1997. Small and endangered languages: A threat to the language or to the speaker?, in: A. F. Christidis, ed. *"Strong" and "weak" languages in the European Union. Aspects of linguistic hegemonism*, Vol. 1. Thessaloniki: Center for the Greek Language. 3-10.
- Jarvad, Pia 1995. *Nye ord. Hvorfor og hvordan?* København: Gyldendal.
- Johansson, Stig and Anne-Line Graedler 2002. *Rocka, hipt og snacksy. Om engelsk i norsk språk og samfunn*. Norwegian Academic Press.
- Johnsen, Egil Børre 1987. *Vårt eget språk: I går og i dag*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Linell, Per 1996:7. *Approaching dialogue: talk and interaction in dialogical perspectives*. Arbetsrapporter från Tema K. Linköping: Department of Communication Studies.
- Masvie, Inger-Lise 1992. *English in Norway. A sociolinguistic study*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Oslo: Institutt for britiske og amerikanske studier.
- Mæhlum, Brit 2002. Engelsk eller norsk? *Samtiden* 4: 130-137.

- Niedzielski, Nancy A. and Dennis R. Preston 2000. *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Preisler, Bent 1999. *Danskerne og det engelske sprog*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Sandøy, Helge 2000. *Lånte fjører eller bunad? Om importord i norsk*. Landslaget for norskundervisning LNU/Cappelen akademisk forlag.
- Voloshinov, Valentin N. 1973. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Wingstedt, Maria 1998. *Language ideologies and minority language policies in Sweden. Historical and contemporary perspectives*. Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.

Hartmut Haberland: Domains and domain loss
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
227-237
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Hartmut Haberland and the Editors, 2005

Domains and domain loss

Hartmut Haberland

*Department of Language and Culture, University of Roskilde,
POB 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark
hartmut@ruc.dk*

Abstract

The domain concept, originally suggested by Schmidt-Rohr in the 1930s (as credited in Fishman's writings in the 1970s), was an attempt to sort out different areas of language use in multilingual societies, which are relevant for language choice. In Fishman's version, domains were considered as theoretical constructs that can explain language choice which were supposed to be a more powerful explanatory tool than more obvious (and observable) parameters like topic, place (setting) and interlocutor.

In the meantime, at least in Scandinavia, the term 'domain' has been taken up in the debate among politicians and in the media, especially in the discussion whether some languages undergo 'domain loss' vis-à-vis powerful international languages like English. A first objection that has been raised is that domains, as originally conceived, are parameters of language choice and not properties of languages, hence languages do not 'have' domains, and therefore cannot lose them. A second objection is that the classical domain concept is not necessarily applicable to the present Danish sociolinguistic situation, since stable multilingualism for in-group communication is absent at least for the dominant group of Danish speakers.

A further objection is concerned with the applicability of the domain concept to actual patterns of language choice in multilingual settings. Especially Pádraig Ó Riagáin has claimed that at least some multilingual situations are best *not* described in terms of domains, and recent research e.g. about the multilingual communities in the Danish-German border area seems to confirm this.

1. Introduction

The concept of 'domain' belongs to those terms in linguistics that try to encapsulate a rather complex situation in a simple word – which is not a bad thing as long as the simplicity of the term doesn't tempt us to see the complex situation as a simple one, once the term is established. Unfortunately, this is exactly what seems to have happened in this case.

About just over ten years ago, at least in Denmark the term 'domain' (or Danish *domæne*) was not known at all outside narrow sociolinguistic circles. Today, *domæne* has become a household word, and every journalist concerned with language policy is familiar with it, and by now also their readers. Strictly speaking, the term that has become popular 'domain loss', *domænetab*, rather than 'domain' in itself.

On the surface, the term has much to commend itself. Around 1990, linguists in Denmark started to get concerned about the perceived pressure from the English language on Danish; very early it was stated in several publications that this pressure did not so much involve the influx of English loans as the increased use of English in contexts within Denmark. The domain concept came in very handy to describe this process: English was taking over domains in Denmark that had previously been reserved for Danish; Danish was losing domains to English.

This has been described elsewhere (e.g. Jarvad 2001), and I will mention only two examples. In the media, about 50% of all TV programs transmitted in Denmark are produced in the USA or in Great Britain. All these programs come with Danish subtitles, but since there is no tradition for dubbing in Denmark, the dialogue or commentary in 50% of all TV programs is in English. In higher education and research, by now university programs are offered in English alongside with Danish by practical all universities and other institutions of higher education, and an increasing number of research results are primarily or only published in English. It has been claimed that especially in the natural sciences and in medicine it is difficult to find scholars that can and are willing to present their results to a Danish audience, which is said to have been a problem for the editors of the 20-volume Danish National Encyclopaedia published between 1994 and 2001.

This situation is usually described as Danish losing domains to English. Danish is being converted from ‘a full-scale language’ to a language that can only be used, and only develops, in certain limited, domestic functions. Behind this, of course, lurks the implied fear of language death – will the Danish language continue to exist, or can the Danish language survive as ‘a full-scale language’?

In this paper, I will argue

- that the theoretical status of the domain concept has not always been taken seriously,
- that the classical domain concept is not necessarily applicable to the present Danish situation, and
- that even in multilingual societies with in-group multilingualism, the domain concept is not always the best tool for describing and explaining language choice.

2. The development of the domain concept

In 1932, Gerhard Schmidt-Rohr published his book *Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker*, which already a year later came in a second printing under the title *Mutter Sprache* (‘Mother language’) (1933). Schmidt-Rohr’s objective was the formulation of a non-biological theory of ‘the people’ (*Volk*). For him, what defines a people was its language – and in spite of anti-Jewish remarks in the Preface to the second edition, he rejected antisemitism, as long as it rests on a biological, racial basis. Fichte and his successors Mazzini and Grundtvig represented for him the correct attitude to the concept of ‘the people’, while Darwin, Gobineau and Chamberlain were rejected due to their biological bias (1933:ix). For Schmidt-Rohr, the identity of a people was based on the unity of language and thought. In this connection he was interested in the question whether bilingualism and multilingualism (“a necessity for many, many millions of the population of the world”, 1933:178) is dangerous or not, and came to the conclusion that “There are types [of bilingualism] which are totally harmless, there are others that have a disastrous effect, murdering souls and destroying mind (“Geist”) and culture.” (1933:179). In order to identify “disastrous” bilingual situations, he distinguished at least eight types of these situations according to the distribution of several languages

(standard and dialect) across different situations of language use (see Table 1). Without coining any term, he effectively introduced the idea of domain – as acknowledged by Fishman (1972:441) – by distinguishing the following nine elements of dominance configurations in bilingual situations:

The family, the playground and street, the school (with three sub-elements: language of instruction, subject of instruction, language of breaks and conversation), the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts, and governmental administration.

Typ

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Familie		D	D(d)	d	D	d	d	d	D
Spielplatz Straße		D	d(D)	d	D	d	d	df	df
Schule	Unterrichtssprache	D	D	D	F	D	F	F	D
	Unterrichtsfach	D(FE)	D(FE)	D	F(D)	DF	F	FD	DF
	Pausen und Unterhaltungssprache	D	D(d)	d	D	d	F	df	df
Kirche		D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
Literatur		D	D	D	DF	DF	F	FD	DF
Zeitung		D	D	D	DF	DF	F(D)	FD	DF
Heer		D	D	D	F	D	F	F	F
Gericht		D	D	D	FD	D	F	FD	FD
Verwaltung		D	D	D	F	DF	F	F	F
		Keine Ein- sprachig- keit		in der Schweiz möglich			Süd- tirol	Ungarn möglich	Expen- Mal- médy möglich

Table 1. Types of bilingual situations according to Schmidt-Rohr (1933:179)

Different configurations of these elements constitute types of bilingualism. The basic type of bilingualism for *Auslandsdeutsche* in the *Alto Adige* region of Italy (“Südtirol”) is thus characterised by the following dominance configuration:

the family	German dialect
the playground and street	German dialect
the school	
language of instruction	Standard Italian
subject of instruction	Standard Italian
language of breaks and conversation	Standard Italian

the church	Standard German
literature	Standard Italian
the press	Standard Italian, possibly Standard German
the military	Standard Italian
the courts	Standard Italian
governmental administration	Standard Italian

Schmidt-Rohr distinguishes these nine elements of dominance configurations without much theoretical reflection or any discussion, and one could call what is implicit in his writings a ‘naïve domain concept’. But already at this early stage of almost pre-theoretical development, an important problem becomes clear: how is the linguist to determine which of the relevant languages is associated with, or at least dominates within, each element of the configuration (or each ‘domain’)? Language use in some of these elements is regulated by law or practice, like in the courts or in the classroom. In other cases it can only be determined empirically, like in school outside the classroom. In other cases yet, the claim of a dominant language remains characteristically diffuse: why is standard Italian considered dominant in literature? Does this mean that there are no local writers who write in Standard German or German dialect? Or does it mean that bookshops do not sell books in German? The association of a domain with a specific language can have very different status. Moreover, these examples show that Schmidt-Rohr’s model does not take into account that the elements of dominance configurations might have to be differentiated with regard to spoken vs. written communication and productive vs. receptive language use. A German customer might well speak Italian in order to buy a German book in a bookshop.

There were a few studies in Germany that followed up Schmidt-Rohr’s ideas, but his concept was only taken up for good, and a term coined, when in the 1970s Joshua Fishman revived the idea in order to analyse multilingual settings with widespread and relatively stable multilingualism and the choices that were taken regularly by multilingual members of these groups.

Language choice, says Fishman, within such multilingual groups is far from random; rather “‘proper’ usage dictates that only *one* of the theoretically co-available languages or varieties *will* be chosen by particular classes of *interlocutors* on particular kinds of *occasions* to discuss particular *topics*.” (1972: 437) The question is now, which elements in the context determine the choices that speakers make. Topic, Place and Interlocutor seem to be relevant, but not sufficient in themselves to describe the choice patterns. Here Fishman introduces the term ‘domain’ as an analytical concept; unlike in the naïve domain concept, the elements of dominance configuration now called ‘domains’ are not considered as given beforehand, but are “defined, regardless of their number, in terms of institutional contexts and their congruent behavioural co-occurrences.” (1972: 441) That is, a domain can only be established when there is a corresponding field of congruent patterns of behaviour. The number of domains can vary between groups and has to be generalised for each multilingual group from careful observation; thus Greenfield (cf. Greenfield and Fishman 1971, originally 1968) concluded that there are five domains that govern the language choices in the New York Puerto Rican speech community: Family, Friendship, Religion, Education and Employment. One of the reasons why Greenfield found fewer domains than Schmidt-Rohr might not just be that Schmidt-Rohr assumed his domains beforehand while Greenfield constructed them carefully on the basis of observations. It might also be because Greenfield seems to have excluded written communication (writing and reading) from his investigation. This will become significant in the discussion of modern Scandinavian domain loss, where the focus is especially (but not exclusively) on writing and listening.

One should note that there are two rather important differences between the naïve domain concept and Fishman's classical domain concept. Schmidt-Rohr assumed that the relevant elements of dominance configurations are the same more or less in all types of multilingual settings and can more or less be set up beforehand; what differs are not the elements but their configuration. According to Fishman, domains are not given beforehand and cannot be observed immediately either, but are introduced as context-dependent empirically valid analytical constructs by the researcher. Their power lies in their predictive force, i.e. their ability to suggest which language a person in a given situation might choose. Second, while the naïve concept of domain is mainly based on the macro-sociolinguistic set-up of a society¹ and its potential cognitive consequences, but less so on the microanalysis of communication, the classical concept of domain is motivated (as suggested by the subtitle of Fishman 1972) by an interest in the relationship between macro- and microsociolinguistics. The guiding *Erkenntnisinteresse* for the latter is to relate concrete language choices in a given situation to the rules and standards for such a choice in a given society – and Fishman claims that such rules exist, i.e. language choice in a multilingual society is not random.

It becomes clear that the concept of domain, as it is used in the debate about domain loss in Scandinavia today, bears only scant similarity to Fishman's classical domain concept. But the term had already undergone a significant broadening with some of Fishman's collaborators in the Puerto Rican project (e.g. “an institutionalized sphere of activity in which language behaviour occurs” (Findling 1971: 337)). In the reception by others, institutionalisation of domains plays an even bigger role. While a formulation like “cluster of social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioral rules” (Fishman 1971:599) still keeps open the possibility that a cluster of social situations is held together by the set of behavioural rules that is common for it, the later reference to the institutionalisation of language behaviour points back to the analysis of society implicit in Schmidt-Rohr, where the number and borders of relevant institutions can be determined *before* any analysis of speech behaviour.

3. Theoretical status of the domain concept

The first objection questions the methodological status of domains, if they are seen as something that languages ‘have’ rather than as elements of dominance configurations. This criticism has, to my knowledge, been raised first by Dag F. Simonsen (2002).

At first glance, it makes sense to say that languages do not have domains (they are not properties of languages), and hence, that they cannot lose domains. But does this reach further than a criticism of untidy terminology, or of a not well thought-out metaphor? If Danish is not used any more, or not used much any more, in certain areas of language use in Denmark, or in situations involving at least Danes on the one side, then this observation has to be described somehow. It may be sloppy to say that Denmark ‘lost’ a domain, like we ‘lose’ territory in a metaphorical sense. Is there more to it than to say that ‘domain loss’ is a metaphor and not to be taken literally?

The problem with metaphors is reification. If you talk about a language losing domains, you end up thinking language having domains. This claim is not simply a piece of Whorfian dogmatism on my side. I am afraid that the patterns of the *mise en discours* of domains have created the idea that domains exist and can be observed, thus falling behind the methodological sophistication achieved

¹ One could say that Schmidt-Rohr's study rather belongs to the sociology of language than to sociolinguistics.

in the classical domain concept. It is not just a methodological nicety, if we insist that theoretical constructs should be treated as such and talked about as such.

The abstractness of the domain concept is also made clear by the fact that in the classical concept, domains are only relevant as elements in dominance configurations. (This is probably why Schmidt-Rohr could dispense with a term for them altogether.) Dominance configurations are conceptually more complex, but observationally more accessible than their elements that could be termed domains; this is because they are much closer to the life world of the bilinguals who experience them. The bilingual language user doesn't ask "In which domain am I now?" but either knows, has to reflect upon, or negotiate what language to choose in the situation he or she is in – a situation which he or she may have difficulties in labelling in the first place.

4. Applicability of the classical domain concept to present-day Denmark

A further objection to talking about domains of language use in contemporary Denmark is that the type of societies that Fishman developed the domain concept for is very different from present Denmark. Denmark is not a 'stable multilingual community', at least not with stable in-group multilingualism for the majority group.

This is not to say that Denmark is not multilingual.² Apart from Danish, at least three other languages have, if not official, at least recognised status: German as the language of the German minority in Southern Jutland, and Faroese and Greenlandic as the languages of the former Danish North Atlantic colonies. Members of the German minority are usually bilingual in German and Danish (very often with a Southern Jutish dialect as the dominant variety). Faroese and Greenlandic speakers are usually bilingual as well, certainly if they have lived in Denmark for some time. For these multilingual groups, a description of their language choices through the domain concept would make sense, since they use both Danish and their primary language for intra-group communication.

There is also a large number of immigrant languages spoken in Denmark, especially in Copenhagen, but also in smaller towns. These groups are very often bilingual in themselves (like the widespread Punjabi–Urdu bilingualism of Pakistanis), but apart from some older members of these communities, their members are bi- or multilingual with Danish as one of their languages. Again, here is room for the application of the classical domain concept.

But when it comes to the majority population, multilingualism takes on a different character. This is *not* a multilingual setting in which "a single population makes use of two (or more) 'languages' [...] for internal communicative purposes." (Fishman 1972: 437)³. Many Danes speak, or at least understand, other languages than Danish, and English is the preferred choice for many. But there are only small subcultural pockets that use other languages than Danish for certain purposes, like the Hip-hop subculture, as described by Preisler (1999). Apart from this, we encounter classic elite multilingualism for inter-group communication, and a widespread, but functionally restricted receptive multilingualism which makes it possible to use English (and, to a lesser extent, other languages) in advertisements.

² Societies can be bi- or multilingual in different ways. One of the most important distinctions must be one between multilingual societies without and with in-group multilingualism.

³ What I have left out is Fishman's addition "or varieties of the 'same language'". It would make the discussion too complicated if I included the choice of (regional, social or prestige) variants within Danish in this paper.

Only if we subscribe to an attenuated domain concept that ties languages and institutionalised contexts together, and does not require that the language choices we are describing are made *within* a community, we can talk about domains in this context.

There is, by the way, nothing new in this situation. Denmark has always, or at least for a long time, been multilingual in this sense: various elites have always used other languages than Danish for inter-group communication. If this system has a dynamic, it is rather characterised by three facts:

- since the middle of C19, there have been no elite groups in Denmark that use other languages than Danish for intra-group communication (as it had been the case up to that point with High German, Low German and to a much lesser extent French),
- since the middle of C20, English has become the preferred language for inter-group and international elite communication, and
- due to an egalitarian educational policy, the scope of elites that are functional in more languages than Danish has widened somewhat.

	Danish	English	French	German
1944		•	••	
1949			•	•
1951			•	•
1954		•		•
1957		•	•	
1959			•	
1960			•	
1972	•			
1973			•	
1975		•		
1976		•		
1979		•		
1980		••		
1986		•		
1989		•	•	
1993	•	•	•	
1995		•		
1996		••		
1999		•		
2001		•		
2002		•		

1944–1960		•••	•••••••	•••
1961–1994	••	••••••••	••••	
1995–2002		•••••••		

Table 2. Publications in the *Travaux* series 1944–2002, by language

The second point is illustrated by a breakdown of languages used in publications by the *Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen*. In 1944 the Circle began publication of a book series with the French title *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*. In the beginning of the period, volumes were

published in English, French and German. The last volume in German was published in 1954, the last in French in 1993. Since 1995, all volumes have been published in English.

During the whole 1944–2002 period, there have only been two publications in Danish, one of them being a special case, since it was a reprint of Hjelmslev's *Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse*, not an original research publication.

If there is any talk of domain loss, it is a loss for French and German, not for Danish.

5. Applicability of the classical domain concept to in-group multilingualism

In his study of the development of Irish bilingualism, Pádraig Ó Riagáin (1997) pointed out that even in situations of intra-group bilingualism, it may be difficult to describe language choice implementing the domain concept. Unfortunately, Ó Riagáin focuses on the criticism against the domain concept and does not give a clear exposition of the concept itself, so that it is difficult to see what domain concept he is actually criticising. He mentions that a large-scale Irish study on English–Irish bilingualism in the Gaeltacht areas⁴ conducted between 1970 and 1975 had difficulties in relating language choices to domains. Following Fishman's original ideas, the criticism should have been that it was impossible to construct domains that corresponded to congruent patterns of behaviour in language choice. Ó Riagáin is very thorough in his discussion of alternative approaches. He sees great merits in network models (Milroy and Milroy) and also in the use of Bourdieu's concept of 'linguistic capital', which he thinks could replace the domain model of description of bilinguals' language choices.

It is also difficult to apply the domain concept to those situations where extensive code-switching is part of the linguistic repertoire of the interlocutors. In these cases, languages sometimes have to be chosen for each utterance and sometimes even within utterances. This again does not mean any random distribution of languages; there are recognisable patterns, but they cannot be attributed to different domains, unless one considers patterns of code-switching as one option in a language choice situation. But this would require a complete redefinition of the domain concept; Fishman wrote that "only *one* of the theoretically co-available languages or varieties *will* be chosen" (1972:437), and in examples like the following, the interlocutors chose several or even all of the languages available to them – again not in a random fashion, but "in congruent patterns of behavior".

The first example is from Parkin's (1974) study of language use in Nairobi markets. The participants are a Kikuyu stallholder and a Luo customer, and the languages used are Luo, Kikuyu, Swahili and English, as well as a hybrid (Swahilized) form. I am giving the text here with annotation of languages and a translation; a detailed analysis can be found in Parkin (1974:194):

KIKUYU STALL-HOLDER: Omera, nadi!

LUO

How are you, brother!

LUO CUSTOMER: Maber.

LUO

Fine.

⁴ i.e. in the areas of Ireland where this kind of bilingualism is widespread

KIKUYU: Ati — nini?

KIKUYU SWAHILI

What what?

LUO: Ya nini kusema lugha ambao huelewi mama?

SWAHILI

Why (try) to speak a language you don't know, mum?

KIKUYU: I know — kijaluo — very well

ENGLISH HYBRID ENGLISH

I know Luo very well!

LUO: Wapi! — You do not know it at all. — Wacha haya, nipe mayai mbili.

SWAHILI ENGLISH

SWAHILI

Go on! You don't know it at all. Anyway, let's leave the matter, and give me a couple of eggs.

KIKUYU: Unataka mayai — ariyo, omera — haya ni — tongolo — tatu.

SWAHILI

LUO

SWAHILI

LUO

SWAHILI

Two eggs, brother? O.K., that will be thirty cents.

In a situation like this here, there is a negotiation going on about which language is appropriate to choose in the context; the Kikuyu stallholder seems to want to impress her customer with her Luo, which he comments on as non-existent. Still, she uses Kikuyu, Swahili and English, while her customer uses Luo, Swahili and English. And the rejection to take up her Luo by the customer is obviously not based on his sense of inappropriateness of Luo, but on his assessment of her receptive fluency: the customer shifts to Swahili only after her lack of uptake of *his* reply in Luo. The choice of languages does not seem to be random, but there is no one language that can be considered to be the obvious shared choice in this type of situation.

Ó Riagáins supposed two alternative analyses might catch certain aspects of the patterning of the situation: The stallholder and the customer obviously disagree about the status of the stallholder in a Lou speaking network, and the stallholder considers Luo to be part of her linguistic capital, but her investment (to stay within the metaphor) turns out to be a failure.

The second example is from Tsitsipis (1991). An old woman comments on tv programs. The languages used are Arvanite (a dialect of Albanian, autochthonous to certain parts of Greece, especially around Athens), and Greek. Only the oldest members of the community are balanced bilinguals, but even the younger ones are receptively bilingual.

chë shómë në telëórasi të bíc prosopía re pedjiá.

ARVANITE

Naní sa cjë thúa. όλα τα πράματα

GREEK

'things we watch on TV make you feel ashamed, guys. What they say. Everything

διαλέγονται, και ο άνθρωπος δεν διαλέγεται. είναι στο κουτί.

can be chosen, and human beings are not chosen. [Man] is in the box.'

Again, the shift from Arvanite to Greek is not conditioned by a change in topic, interlocutor or place. The whole exchange takes place in the same domain – Tsitsipis' analysis is that the language shift marks that the Greek part of the conversation is on a higher level of abstraction.⁵

⁵ I do not know if it would mean to overstretch my data to venture the hypothesis that the language of highest prestige (Greek, English) is used for reflexive comments (metatransactional or interactional remarks in Parkin's example, generalizations in Tsitsipis'), while the language of lower prestige (Swahili, Arvanite) is used for transaction (buying

Finally I want to present an example from Southern Jutland, a bilingual area (German–Danish) south of the German-Danish border (cf. Pedersen 2000a, b). Karen Margrethe Pedersen describes an annual meeting of a Danish sports association, where both languages play a role. This starts with an invitation written in both languages. During the meeting itself, both languages are used, but following an established pattern. The more ritual or pre-set and symbolic the utterances are, the higher is the likelihood that they are made in Danish. On the other hand, the more spontaneous and content-oriented the utterances are, the higher is the likelihood that they are made in German. There is also a functional distribution between participants: the chairperson of the meeting is more likely to speak Danish than the participants. (Pedersen 2000b:67-74)

Again, a meeting of this kind should be within *one* domain. Still, both languages are used, but again not randomly.⁶ Danish is used for identification, German for content communication. This is part of the acknowledged setting for a meeting of this kind, and all the participants know what “‘proper’ usage” requires of them.

6. Conclusion

I hope to have shown that the concept of domain should be used with a certain precaution. If one distinguishes three domain concepts: the naïve domain concept (Schmidt-Rohr), the classical domain concept (Fishman) and the extended domain concept (later Fishman and successors), it should be clear that only the extended domain concept can deal with the kind of domains usually assumed in an analysis of modern societies with a dominant majority language but widespread elite multilingualism for out-of-group interaction. On the other hand, even the classical domain concept cannot explain all kinds of language choices within a multilingual group of speakers, if these choices are not of an either–or type for a whole conversation or interaction.

The latter problem could be solved by allowing that in certain domains code-switching is considered ‘proper usage’. This would be in line with an attitude to code-switching which has gained ground lately and which considers code-switching as a legitimate expressive resource of bilinguals. This would also avoid the strict coupling of languages to domains, but we would still have to explain the non-randomness of code-switching.

There is no doubt that the phenomenon often described today by the term ‘domain loss’ exists, but the question is how to describe and analyse it, and whether any of the different concepts of domain are really helpful here. Obviously, what we are dealing with here is language choice in linguistic communities as a way of making best use of linguistic resources. With a view to language policy, the dynamics of these communities is probably best captured by not thinking in terms of ‘either–or’ choices, but by considering the possibility of enhancing individual and societal choices to the largest degree possible. In this way we do not end up with a win–lose situation, but hopefully with a win–win situation.

eggs) or descriptive statements. Languages of doubtful sharedness (Luo) can be used as impressive markers by one speaker and dismissed as noise by the other. Isolated examples are, of course, not sufficient to establish *patterns* here.

⁶ One might doubt the fully bilingual status of the group, since there are usually people present who are not bilingual. It seems that this fact can influence language choices locally (if only for the trivial reason that a monolingual speaker has no languages to choose between when speaking), but they do not seem to influence the overall pattern of language distribution.

References

- Findling, Joav 1971. Bilingual need affiliation and future orientation in extra-group and intra-group domains, in: Joshua A. Fishman, Robert L. Cooper, Roxana Ma et al. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University and The Hague: Mouton, 337-344. (Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monographs, 7)
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1971. The relationship between micro- and macrosociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when, in: Joshua A. Fishman, Robert L. Cooper, Roxana Ma et al. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University and The Hague: Mouton. 583-604. (Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monographs, 7)
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. Domains and the relationship between micro- and macrosociolinguistics. In: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics. The ethnography of speaking*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 407-434 [originally 1971, several reprints]
- Greenfield, Lawrence and Joshua A. Fishman 1971. Situational measures of normative language views of person, place and topic among Puerto Rican bilinguals, in: Joshua A. Fishman, Robert L. Cooper, Roxana Ma et al. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University and The Hague: Mouton. 233-253. (Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monographs, 7)
- Jarvad, Pia 2001. *Det danske sprogs status i 1990'erne med særligt henblik på domænetab*. Copenhagen: Dansk Sprogævn.
- Ó Riagáin, Pádraig 1997. *Language policy and social reproduction: Ireland 1893-1993*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Parkin, David 1974. Language switching in Nairobi, in: Wilfried H. Whiteley, ed. *Language in Kenya*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 189-216
- Pedersen, Karen Margrethe 2000a. *Dansk sprog i Sydslesvig*, Vol. 1. Åbenrå: Institut for Grænseregionsforskning
- Pedersen, Karen Margrethe 2000b. *Dansk sprog i Sydslesvig*, Vol. 2. Åbenrå: Institut for Grænseregionsforskning
- Preisler, Bent 1999. *Danskerne og det engelske sprog*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde universitetsforlag
- Schmidt-Rohr, Georg 1933. *Mutter Sprache – Vom Amt der Sprache bei der Volkwerdung*. Jena: Eugen Diederichs
- Simonsen, Dag F. 2002. Å velge bort norsk. Om begrepene 'domene' og 'domenetap' anvendt på skandinaviske land. *Norsklæreren* 2.
- Simonsen, Dag F. 2005. Over the fence – and into English? Reflections on adolescents, academics, linguistic development and language policy in Norway in the early 2000s. in: Bent Preisler et al. eds. 2005, *The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones*. Roskilde: Roskilde University, Dept. of Language and Culture. <http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/Mobility/>
- Tsitsipis, Loukas D. 1991. Terminal-fluent speaker interaction and the contextualization of deviant speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15:153-173

Bent Preisler: Deconstructing 'the domain of science' as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies: The relationship between English and Danish in higher education and research
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
238-248
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Bent Preisler and the Editors, 2005

Deconstructing 'the domain of science' as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies: The relationship between English and Danish in higher education and research

Bent Preisler

Department of Language and Culture, University of Roskilde, Denmark
preisler@ruc.dk

Abstract

Preisler introduces the Danish debate concerning the influence of English on Danish language and language use, and – drawing on previous research – describes what he sees as the two 'sides' in the debate: (1) the 'followers,' i.e. the vast majority of the population whose attitude to English is simply instrumental, and who embrace the influence of English as a manifestation of internationalization; (2) 'the concerned,' a small but influential minority whose views on the influence of English are more critical, and who represent the cultural elite. He then takes a quick detour into postmodernism, deconstructing the concepts of 'Language' and 'Domain,' and redefining the latter as 'practice' in an ethnographic sense. Taking a closer look at the relationship between English and Danish within one particular 'domain,' the 'domain of science,' where English is often thought to have won out, he shows that this is really *two* domains (i.e. practices): the domain of university *research*, and that of university *teaching*. Only in the domain of university teaching does it make sense to talk about a potential 'domain loss' for Danish, whereas Preisler concludes that, within the domain of university research, English and Danish are functionally distributed, and that this does not in itself affect the status of Danish within Danish society.

1. Introduction

The empirical basis of this chapter¹ is a sociolinguistic situation in Denmark, but the developments that it describes apply – to a greater or lesser, but certainly *increasing*, degree – to many other countries where English is a foreign language. In spite of the fact that, according to some fundamental criteria, English must still be considered a foreign rather than a second language in Denmark, the Danish general public is constantly exposed to the English language as they go through their everyday lives. Code switching² to English is the rule rather than the exception, and

¹ I am indebted to Hartmut Haberland for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. He is not, of course, to blame for any weaknesses that remain.

² I use the term 'code switching' to refer to a bilingual speaker/writer's casual alternation between at least two languages (or features from these languages) during a verbal encounter with another bilingual person. Such alternation typically involves the substitution of lexical items and idiomatic expressions, but may in principle affect any level of linguistic description including sentences and beyond (as when two speakers switch languages according to topic).

words and messages in English abound everywhere: on the job, in leisure time activities, on the street, in the supermarket, on the Internet, in the printed media and on radio and TV. The English language has become the symbol of globalization. However, in the wake of increasing internationalization in trade, politics, education and mass culture follows a corresponding tendency toward *localization*, with a growing interest in the values of the local society, in regional and national characteristics, and in one of the most important symbols of modern nationhood, the national language. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the growing presence of the English language in Denmark has given rise to a public debate – as it has in other English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) countries – on the possible consequences of the influence of English, and on the relevance of introducing language policies to protect (or ‘strengthen’) the national language. The Danish language debate is introduced in section 2 below. In Section 3, I describe the majority in the debate, the ‘followers,’ to whom the English language is merely a useful instrument of international communication, and who therefore do not see the increase in the use of English in Danish society as in any way problematic. The most voluble ‘followers’ are the representatives of the export industry and international big business. In Section 4, I discuss the more critical views of ‘the concerned,’ a small but influential cultural elite made up of teachers of Danish at various levels, newspaper editors, writers and other groups with a purist attitude toward the Danish language. I then take a closer look at the relationship between English and Danish within the ‘domain of science,’ deconstructing the concepts of ‘Language’ (Section 5) and ‘Domain’ (Section 6), and redefining the ‘domain’ as a ‘community of practice.’ I argue that the ‘domain of science’ consists of (at least) two separate domains, i.e. the domain of university *research*, where English and Danish are functionally distributed according to the ethnic composition of research networks within this domain (Section 7); and the domain of university *teaching* (Section 8), where official language policies stipulating the use of English, to facilitate international cooperation and exchange, are increasingly being superimposed on entire educational programs, affecting the long-term status of Danish as a language viable for use in the formal transmission of knowledge (Section 9).

2. The language debate in Denmark

In 1998, concern for the national language had reached a level that induced the Danish Language Council to arrange a conference in Copenhagen on the growing influence of English on Danish.³ The main worry was the host of English loan words that were making their way into the Danish vocabulary, but also the status of the Danish language as such, in terms of its continued ability to function across the whole range of public domains characteristic of a nation.

As in other European countries – France, for example – most of those who expressed concern for the national language were representatives of the cultural and educational elite. My own large-scale investigation into attitudes toward English in the general population, published in Danish (Preisler, 1999a), shows that the English language is highly prestigious in Denmark, as is a degree of Danish-English bilingualism in the individual. English is seen primarily as a key to participation in the internationalization process. If we were to characterize briefly the attitude of the average Dane toward the influence of the English language in Denmark, we could do so with reference to a particular contribution to the Danish language-policy debate, an article written by Erik Hansen, Iver Kjær and Jørn Lund (2000), entitled ‘Styrk sproget’ (‘strengthen the language’). Here we find a list of attitude

Many loan words and other borrowings are introduced into the target language via the process of code switching, and my definition of code switching includes the use of words whose official loan-word status is so recent as to be less than completely consolidated in the minds of ordinary speakers.

³ At ‘Schæffergården,’ on March 21, 1998.

stereotypes supposed to cover the whole range of typical reactions to the English language in Denmark: some Danes are *frightened*, some are in *doubt* as to how they should react, some are *unconcerned*, some are *ignorant* of any problem, some think they *have all the answers*, some are *followers* accepting the development uncritically, and some *oppose* it. My own investigation tends to place the average Dane among the ‘followers.’ They are described thus:

Medløberen synes, at vi skal ruste os til den nye sproglige verdensorden, lade være med at klynke og sørge for at placere engelsk stærkere i skolen og uddannelserne, ja helst introducere det i børnehaveklassen og vuggestuerne. At sprog er andet end kommunikation, er ikke gået op for medløberen (Hansen et al., 2000).

‘The follower thinks we should prepare ourselves for the new linguistic world order, stop whining, and see to it that English is strengthened as a subject in the Danish schools and educational system, preferably introducing it into kindergarten and day nurseries. It has not occurred to the follower that language is more than communication.’

3. The ‘followers’

It is the attitude of the ‘follower’ that prompts the Danish business community and politicians to believe that schoolchildren cannot learn English early enough. Most recently the Danish parliament has decided that the teaching of EFL is now to start in the third grade, where previously English was introduced in the fourth grade. Although there is no evidence that this in itself will result in the children being more English proficient when they *leave* school than they are now at school leaving age, this does not worry the ‘follower’: to the ‘follower,’ the new law signals a readiness on the part of the government to meet the needs of the business community, which today also means the needs of internationalization.

And the ‘followers’ constitute a vast majority in Denmark: the high status of EFL as a school subject is based on the awareness that, in an internationalized world, Danes have to be able to communicate with non-Danes, and that the English language is the most widely used language of international communication. Though only one out of four Danes thinks the children should have as many hours of EFL in school as they have of Danish, my investigation shows that more than one third of all Danish adults would accept a suggestion that other classes besides English classes be conducted *in English*, e.g. geography classes.

The predominantly positive attitude toward the presence of English in Danish society was reflected in the following gradient from the same investigation (first presented in English in Preisler, 1999b):⁴

AGREE

‘The presence of the English language in Danish society is...

- | | |
|--|------|
| a. ...a practical consequence of increased internationalization’ | 92 % |
| b. ...useful because it helps improve people’s English’ | 89 % |
| c. ...useful because it broadens people’s cultural horizon’ | 69 % |

⁴ For each statement the options were (1) ‘I agree very much,’ (2) ‘I agree with some reservations,’ (3) ‘I disagree to some extent,’ (4) ‘I strongly disagree,’ (5) ‘I don’t know.’ The summary is a count of (1) and (2) lumped together.

d. ...a threat to the Danish language'	26 %
e. ...a threat to Danish culture'	19 %
f. ...a craze not to be taken seriously'	16%

These figures confirm the predominant 'follower' attitude in the Danish population, with its huge emphasis on the *instrumental* functions of the English language, as the key to participation in the internationalization process, though more than two thirds of respondents also expected the presence of the English language in Danish society to 'broaden their cultural horizon.'

4. The concerned

In Denmark, those expressing concern for the Danish language in the newspapers – e.g. in letters to the editor, or feature articles contributed by non-journalists (usually people with some professional interest in the language debate) are often representatives of the educational or cultural elite. It is hardly surprising to find, therefore, that the percentage of those who are, to a varying degree, worried about – or critical of – the influence of English tends to be a little higher among people with a postgraduate education than the rest. This group numbers 50 respondents out of a total of 856 respondents constituting a random sample of the Danish adult population.

For example, although Danes with a postgraduate education do not believe any more than the rest of the population that English constitutes a threat to Danish language or culture – and even do not differ significantly with regard to the percentage who agree that school subjects like geography should be taught in English – only 12 % of Danes with a postgraduate education agree that EFL should be given the same numbers of hours in the schools as (mother-tongue) Danish, against 29 % in the rest of the population ($p < 0.05$).

Looking at people's attitudes toward the use of English in texts targeted at the Danish public, e.g. ads and commercials, we find that, whereas the average Dane is either 'indifferent' or thinks it makes the text 'exciting' to read/listen to, Danes with a postgraduate education find it much less 'exciting,' in fact almost one third of respondents with a postgraduate education find the use of English in such texts 'affected,' a category which in the rest of the population is picked only by one out of ten ($p < 0.05$).

Language attitudes can also be expressed more subtly. Most Danes believe that 'the use of English (in Denmark) reflects the need for a world language.' However, of those with a postgraduate education, 53 % choose the category 'influence from the USA' to explain the use of English in Denmark, against only 36 % in the rest of the population ($p < 0.1$). Asked whether they would like to *live* in the USA, they tend to give a negative answer more often than the average for the population,⁵ and so the impression remains that Danes with a postgraduate education are slightly more critical of the English influence than the rest.

Conversely, one might try to measure the relative importance of value symbols associated with *Danish* language and/or culture. This was the aim behind the statement, in the questionnaire, that 'it is important that Danish authors be subsidized by the State.' Whereas 85 % of people with a

⁵ This is a tendency only – the percentage difference is not statistically significant.

postgraduate education expressed (varying degrees of) agreement, rather than disagreement, with this claim, the corresponding figure for the rest of the respondents was only 59 % ($p < 0.01$).

All in all, people with a postgraduate education – the educational and cultural elite – appear to be ‘followers’ to a slightly *lesser* extent than the rest of the Danish population, and of course, all things considered, finding a somewhat more reflective attitude on the part of precisely this group could hardly be unexpected. Some of these distinguished individuals may even have invested part of their professional prestige in mastering the written norm of Standard Danish, be they university teachers, newspaper editors, writers, government administrators, attorneys, or whatever. This would perhaps tend to make them particularly wary of the impact of English on Danish, which they might see – not as a threat to the Danish language as such but – as a potential threat to this particular norm, hence to their own professional identity. Their very professions guarantee them a disproportionate amount of space in the public media, which is why some of them have been moderately successful in catching the attention of Danish politicians, of whom they demand a language policy (which Denmark has never had before).

What are they worried about? Well, some of them still believe the influence from English constitutes a process of – not just change but – deterioration of the Danish language code. This fear is as persistent as it is absurd, though the debate seems to have put it to rest for the moment. The prevailing attitude now seems to be that the vitality of a language depends precisely on its ability to integrate and absorb input from other languages.

The other worry, real or imagined, is the possibility that the Danish language will lose some of its functional domains to English. Corporate business, advertising, transport, information technology and youth culture are among the internationalized domains frequently mentioned as being in the danger zone. They also include higher education and scientific/scholarly research. ‘Domain loss,’ too, leads to a qualitative, not just a quantitative, reduction of the language: a language cannot develop its vocabulary in domains where it is not used. If English were the only language used in higher education and research, this would seriously impair the function of Danish as a vehicle of new scientific and scholarly knowledge.

5. Deconstructing ‘The Language’

I was recently a member of an ad hoc committee appointed by the Danish Rectors’ Conference for the purpose of producing a proposal for a Danish language policy for the universities. In the following I’ll deal with some of the issues discussed in the committee’s report, but before going any further, let’s look a little more closely at (1) the concept of ‘language,’ and (2) the concept of language ‘domain.’

Initially, it is important to remember that the abstractions we make when we discuss complicated issues have only one purpose: to make things look simpler than they are. Thus, in our minds, the Language (with a capital L) acquires a life of its own which has no objective reality. According to the metaphors we use about the Language, it is a physical object, which we would like to preserve unchanged, but which will ‘deteriorate’ if we do not ‘protect’ it. Or the Language is a belligerent power, which can ‘win’ or ‘lose’ domains.

However, in the real world there are only the *users* of a language, diverse as they are in respect of linguistic competence and attitudes toward their own language and that of others; and the actual *use*

of the language in concrete situations, i.e. the (written and spoken) *texts* of the language, which are as multitudinous and diverse. The Language (with a capital L) is a construct whose ‘objective’ existence is limited to the dictionary and the grammar book, and even here it represents an arbitrary choice among many possible related models.

Deconstructing the Language in this way (to use postmodernist terminology), we realize that – whereas it does not really make sense to say that the Language can deteriorate, there is nothing illogical in claiming that the *linguistic competence of users* of the language can deteriorate. On the contrary, it is a well-known fact that linguistic competence which is not exercised on a regular basis will deteriorate. This is true whether we are talking about people who, leaving the region where they grew up, forget the dialect of their childhood, or people who can no longer speak French, which they learned in school, because they did not have enough opportunities to practice it *after* they left school. In other words, if Danish scientists and scholars were to use *only* English in their research and research environments, for years, this would affect their ability to convey their research results in comprehensible, precise and idiomatic Danish. To the extent that Danish researchers *conceptualize* in English, to the exclusion of Danish, their ability to communicate their achievements to the Danish public, e.g. in the form of textbooks suitable for different levels of the Danish school system, will be impaired.

6. Deconstructing the ‘Domain’ concept

As to the concept of ‘domain loss,’ the worst-case scenario is that more and more internationalized domains in the public sphere might be ‘lost’ in favor of the English language, which would turn Danish into the low-status language of a diglossic society, spoken only at home and in informal situations among family and friends. However, the domain concept, too, could do with a little deconstruction before we can employ it in a language-policy discussion. Joshua Fishman (1972) originally distinguished, with Greenfield, five domains: family, friendship, religion, work and education. According to Fishman,

Domains are defined ... in terms of *institutional contexts* or *socio-ecological co-occurrences*. They attempt to designate the *major clusters of interaction situations that occur in particular multilingual settings*. Domains enable us to understand that *language choice* and *topic*, appropriate though they may be for analyses of individual behavior at the level of face-to-face verbal encounters, are ... related to widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations (1972:19; Fishman’s italics).

Fishman’s definition stresses the ‘co-occurrences’ and ‘major clusters’ of interaction situations that enable us to identify a domain, and I would agree that in terms of a *structural* description, there would often be a high degree of correlation between a cluster of ‘congruent situations’ (1972:22) and language choice and topic (though, at the level of generality where only five societal domains are distinguished, the relationship between socio-cultural norms and expectations, on the one hand, and the language choice and topics of individual speech encounters, on the other, must be very indirect indeed). However, when it comes to investigating a concept such as ‘domain loss,’ in relation to the influence of English on EFL societies, a structural description is not particularly useful or interesting. The problem is that even though particular clusters of ‘congruent situations’ may be *characterized* by particular language choices, these language choices are not necessarily related to any (or the same) ‘widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations.’ In fact, as I will

point out in the following, they may be related to particular *patterns of linguistic competence* at the level of individual verbal encounters.’

According to my own definition, a domain is an area of social practice that can be identified on the basis of the nature and special characteristics of the practice, its localization in time and place, and its domain-specific role relationships.

7. The ‘Domain of Science’

Delimiting relevant domains is obviously difficult. For example, in a recent survey of the status of the Danish language by Pia Jarvad (2001), higher education and research are lumped together as the domain of ‘science,’ and Jarvad claims that English has already taken over as the language of this domain (2001:19). Yet it emerges that it is only in the natural sciences that publications in English predominate. In the social sciences only between one third and half of the research is published in English, and English is even less prominent in the published research of the humanities and other areas where the object of study frequently involves Danish language and culture.

My own field happens to be the *English* language. But even English-scholars recognize that as a university subject in Denmark, the study of English is invariably influenced by its Danish EFL context. Among other things, this means that some research on English language and literature is published in Danish. In rare cases, Danish research on the English language may even be published in a third language, as when two years ago an article of mine, on the influence of English on Danish, appeared in German (Preisler, 2001). Courses are taught in English – so as to strengthen the students’ English proficiency – though Danish is used in Danish-English and English-Danish translation. Student project groups are supervised in English, but the group will hardly continue speaking English after their supervisor has left the meeting. Of course, if even one member of the group is non-Danish, the language will be English throughout.

Communication between Danish researchers in the field of English is in Danish, not English. For example, researchers in the field of English from Danish universities hold an annual conference to discuss developments in the field. At the plenary sessions of this conference, the language spoken is Danish, because all tenured foreign personnel are expected to at least be able to *understand* Danish. The foreigners’ own contributions may be in English, but the responses are often in Danish, and the discussion tends to quickly slip back into Danish. In the bar in the evening, on the other hand, where conversation takes place in small groups, the language, typically, will be English if even one person in the group is less fluent in Danish than in English.

Ordinarily at work, when a few Danish English-scholars hold an informal meeting, or email each other, the language is Danish regardless of the topic. If a person joins the conversation who is not fluent in Danish, they will switch to English.⁶ If the mother tongue of one of these colleagues is English, though he or she speaks Danish fluently, the topic will determine the choice of language: If the topic relates to the content of their teaching or research, the language will be English. However, if the topic is some administrative matter which relates specifically to Danish universities or the Danish educational system, the language will automatically be Danish.

⁶ I use the word *switch* here in a non-technical sense, i.e. this phenomenon is not ‘code switching.’

In other words, the choice of language does not, even in the English Department, follow as a matter of course. And I have no doubt that the choice of language is at least as complex in the other scholarly and scientific branches of the university. The debate on the ‘invasion’ of English in internationalized domains has been dominated by a one-to-one perception of the relationship between domain and language, according to which the two languages cannot coexist peacefully within the same domain. Once a domain has been ‘conquered’ by English, this means that the domain itself defines the choice of language – the domain will *by convention* require that its practices be conducted in English.

However, it is not the domain as such that requires the choice of English in the research environment. Rather, the choice of language is determined by the relationship between participants in the social networks existing within this environment: If all the members of a network have Danish as their mother tongue or are expected to know Danish, then – everything else being equal – they will speak or write with each other in Danish. How many technical terms in English slip into the Danish discourse is, of course, irrelevant. Such code switching to English does not constitute speaking or writing ‘in English’ (on the contrary, the use of English words and expressions in the Danish scientific register may be a manifestation of the continued, spontaneous renewal of the ‘language of science’ that a Danish language policy would seek to ensure, comparable to the way the language of science used to seamlessly absorb German, French and Latin elements in earlier periods of the history of Danish). If one or more of the actual or potential participants in the communication cannot be expected to know Danish – including the readership of an international scientific or scholarly journal – the language chosen will be one that the majority of participants would be familiar with, usually English. If the participants have different mother tongues, while in fact mastering each other’s languages, the factor determining which language will be chosen could be e.g. the topic, the situational context and/or the relationship between participants.

8. University teaching and the (required) use of English

The domain of university research, as we saw, is characterized by its many international social networks, i.e. many networks employing English as a lingua franca. In this, it is not essentially different from most internationalized domains. For example, although in the domain of corporate business English is often the declared ‘corporate language’ of corporations in Denmark, it is – according to Jarvad (2001) – a myth that English is the only language spoken or written in these corporations. The choice of language depends on the nature of social networks and communicative situations. Even in the domain of advertising, the frequent use of English depends on the individual product and expected target group.

In fact, there are few domains in Danish society where convention or an explicit rule dictates that all communication be in English. I can think of only three. One is air traffic control: communication between cockpit and control tower has to be in English, regardless of whether both pilot and controller are mother-tongue speakers of Danish. Another is rock music: certain genres require lyrics in English, even if both band and audience are Danish. The third is so closely related to university research that most people (including many scholars) do not distinguish between them in discussions of language policy. This is the domain of higher education – more specifically, those educational programs where study regulations specify that the language of instruction is English, regardless of students’ mother tongue.

It is in the domain of internationalized education – particularly higher education – that stipulations to the effect that the language of instruction be English could turn out to be a problem, affecting the status of the national language. The pressure on institutions of higher education to create educational programs in English is tremendous. The reason being, of course, that no university can participate in the international exchange of students and teachers without offering at least some of its educational components in a language that exchange students and professors can be expected to know. However, to the extent that the English language is institutionalized as the language of higher education, in Denmark, this will gradually create the impression that the Danish language is less well suited as the language of higher education, and as time passes this impression will eventually be correct. In turn, graduates who have received their education in the English language will unfortunately be less well suited for jobs and professions in Denmark. Not least because the quality of this education, too, could be impaired if Danish-mother-tongue professors of history, philosophy or literature were to teach only in the English language.

Educational programs completely in English *are* being introduced (1995, for instance, saw the establishment of a medical program taught completely in English). But even though there are now, necessarily, some restrictions on the use of Danish in an increasingly mobile academic community, it is still possible to ensure that Danish retain its status as a language of higher education in all fields. A minimal requirement is that at least some central components of each educational program be offered in a Danish as well as an English version. Unfortunately, my own experience on a language-policy committee (see above) dominated by university politicians is that this is precisely where the battle will have to be fought: to the extent that programs are offered in English, universities will be inclined to abandon the Danish version, because offering both is twice as expensive. Thus the fate of Danish as a language usable for higher education will depend on whether or not Danish politicians are willing to pay the price!

9. Conclusion: university research and the functional distribution of English and Danish

I have argued that the language policy problems involved in university teaching and university research, respectively, are so different that ‘higher education and research’ should not be regarded as one domain in sociolinguistics, however informal the definition of ‘domain.’ Educational programs, apart from constituting distinctive social practices and role relationships, are defined within a national political context, with reference to national needs. The natural choice of language for teaching in Denmark, everything else being equal, is Danish, and so international student and teacher mobility is by definition a threat to the viability of Danish as the language of instruction in higher education. University research, on the other hand, knows of no national boundaries (at least not in a post-cold-war era), taking place in transnational networks within which the language of communication is negotiated among the participants themselves. This language, for historical reasons, will often be English. By the same token, research results have to be published in a language that an international target group can be expected to understand. It is hardly reasonable, therefore, to regard Danish researchers’ internationally published research as representing a potential ‘domain’ for the Danish language, which has been ‘lost’ to English.

The domain of university research, in fact, constitutes an interface between the local and the international. In this interface there is a need for communicating locally with other Danish researchers and, not least, with the local society that finances the research, and which can expect in return to be able to both understand and use the research. And there is a need for international communication with scientists and scholars in other countries, to ensure that the quality of the

research is second to none on a world scale. This makes for a natural division of labor between Danish and other languages (particularly English) in this domain, based on the endeavor to ensure optimal communication: Danish is likely to be the preferred language in local networks dominated by native speakers of Danish. English will be the preferred language, in Denmark, in transnational networks with a known, or potential, element of participants who do not know each other's mother tongues.

Language, as was implied at the beginning of this chapter, is more than communication, and the 'division of labor' between Danish and English is perhaps not as clear-cut in the real world as it is in theory. The English language is a value symbol in Denmark, associated with the practices of Anglo-American youth subcultures on the one hand, and the prestige of education and success on the other, cp. the distinction between 'English from Below' and 'English from Above' in Preisler (1999a, 1999b). It is quite possible that English is sometimes chosen mechanically for its symbolic value or even required by the university or department by way of signaling a policy of internationalization, regardless of whether the particular thesis or article is likely to be published internationally. The relationship between language of publication, on the part of the Danish researcher, and factors such as academic identity and target-group consciousness no doubt merits closer sociolinguistic scrutiny. However, the consequences of an 'unwarranted' choice of English – and its significance from the point of view of language policy – would seem to be limited. Research written in English which is not published internationally is unlikely to reach beyond a very narrow circle of Danish academics. Furthermore, as the *overt* justification for writing an academic report in English inevitably rests on communicative criteria, anyway (i.e. English is chosen 'just in case' an international audience might exist), this means that the idea of the division of labor between Danish and English is present even here, and that the choice of English in such cases would not necessarily affect the *status* of Danish.

According to some, the 'division of labor' between Danish and English (i.e. the functional distribution of the two languages) within the field of research and research dissemination amounts to a diglossic situation: Danish is for 'home use,' whereas English represents the Danes' face to the world. However, in a typical diglossic society the choice of language is determined by the domain as such, and the high or low status of the domain rubs off on the *language*. Within the domain of scientific research, on the other hand, the choice of English, Danish or any other language is determined by the competence of the actual or expected members of the network. The status of the Danish language does not suffer from Danish researchers publishing their *international* articles in English, because – given the nature of the network – Danish is not an option. The status of Danish as a language of scholarship and science suffers only if Danish researchers neglect to publish locally-oriented research in Danish at the same time (for Danish journals, textbooks etc.) – including popularized research for the Danish general public – because this is where Danish can and should continue to develop its scientific and scholarly register. To a much greater extent than is the case today, scientific and scholarly research should be made accessible for different media aimed at a wide variety of local target groups. And not only should the flow of 'de-professionalized' information be stimulated in this way, for the benefit of non-specialist audiences. The interdisciplinary sharing of research results within the local research environments, too, constitutes a natural context for the use and further development of the national language.

References

- Fishman, Joshua A. 1971. *Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. The Relationship between micro-and macro-sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when, in: J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 15-32.
Hansen, Erik, Iver Kjær and Jørn Lund 2000. Styrk sproget. *Nyt fra Sprognet* 2 (June), Copenhagen.

- Jarvad, Pia 2001. *Det danske sprogs status i 1990'erne med særligt henblik på domænetab*. Copenhagen: Dansk Sprognævn.
- Lauridsen, Karen M. et al. 2003. *Sprogpolitik på de danske universiteter. Rapport med anbefalinger*. Copenhagen: Rektorkollegiet.
- Preisler, Bent 1999a. *Danskerne og det engelske sprog*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Preisler, Bent 1999b. Functions and forms of English in a European EFL country, in: T. Bex and R. Watts, eds. *Standard English: The widening debate*. London: Routledge. 239-267.
- Preisler, Bent 2001. Englisch von Oben und von Unten: Sprachwandel und kulturelle Identität in Dänemark, in: Watts, Richard and H. Murray, eds. *Die fünfte Landessprache? Englisch in der Schweiz*. Bern: vdf Hochschulverlag AG. 35-51.

Dag F. Simonsen: Over the fence – and into English? Reflections on adolescents, academics, linguistic development and language policy in Norway in the early 2000s
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
249-271
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Dag F. Simonsen and the Editors, 2005

Over the fence – and into English? Reflections on adolescents, academics, linguistic development and language policy in Norway in the early 2000s

Dag F. Simonsen

*The Norwegian Language Council, Oslo, Norway
dag.f.simonsen@sprakrad.no*

Abstract

After a discussion of recent language-policy developments in the Scandinavian countries, and of the domain loss theory saying English may displace Scandinavian languages in crucial sectors of society, a model is sketched that links the progress of English to people's free choices, presupposing (1) bilingualism in the national language and English, (2) arenas where real choices are possible and (3) motives for preferring English.

This model is applied to youth language and academic language in Norway, on the basis of recent research. In both cases, there has been an increase in people's competence in English as well as in the number of arenas and motives for using English. As for the adolescents, in spite of the strongly positive symbolic value they ascribe to English, there are few indications that they are really dropping Norwegian, whereas academics tend to use English more, both in publishing and in other discipline-related activities.

Finally the author reflects upon the consequences that should be drawn in relation to language policy. Youth marks a period of freedom, and Norwegian adolescents' use of language doesn't necessarily forebode a transition into English, and so should be stimulated rather than limited. Contrary to this, academic language use is already governed by regulations, and may be further regulated, if necessary by law, so as to promote parallel use of Norwegian and English at the universities.

Introduction

In this article I will discuss some issues in Norwegian language policy that have been made topical by the general globalization – including especially some current politically managed tendencies in the knowledge system and also the increased social mobility in Norway and on a global basis – and by the international spread of English.

First I outline briefly the policy run by the state for the last decade and a half to restrain the increasing influence of English upon the Norwegian language, and then I go on to comment on a number of problematic aspects of the perspective underlying this policy. Here I will deal with the theory of loss of domains in particular that says that Norwegian language may lose whole societal areas of language use to English. Subsequently I look at some recent data from two large “areas” in

society that are considered to be important in this context, namely (i) adolescents and their language use, and (ii) the academic communities of knowledge – equivalent to the social groups made up by the professionals of the university sector when grouped together to deal with subject-related issues in their own field. Finally, after a discussion of what conclusions one may draw from this, I also assess what language policy challenges this poses to the authorities.

This article, then, does not deal with the traditional issues in Norwegian controversies on language policy, but rather with the development of new varieties of Norwegian linked to social mobility, with the increased use of English linked to globalization and also with what language policy measures the state should implement to meet with a radically new linguistic situation in Norway. So we should really keep in mind that a true *overall* assessment of this situation would have to include several other important factors as well – factors that cannot be discussed here – especially the relationship between written and spoken Norwegian and between the two written standards of Norwegian, named Bokmål and Nynorsk.

Recent state language policy in Norway and Scandinavia

Traditionally, Norway used to be one of the linguistically most homogeneous states in Europe. At the same time, national and nationalistic trends, very often in some socially orientated version, have been an important political force and have also put their stamp on the policy of culture and language. This country has an old and strong tradition of language planning and also, as opposed to Denmark and Sweden, has language legislation, both on the use of Bokmål and Nynorsk and on the use of the Sámi language. But Norway also has got an open economy and was for several hundred years a recipient of external social, cultural and linguistic impulses. In accordance with this, foreign language education in schools has long been given priority (for some years now, this tends to mean English only), and so people, broadly speaking, have a high competence in English, even though there are very few English mother tongue speakers in Norway.

Like several other countries, Norway is today affected by the great migrations of the world and has received both migrant workers, refugees and asylum seekers, who have brought hundreds of new languages to the country. And yet, much less attention has been paid to this than to the spread of English in the media and other channels. At an early stage the spread of English gave rise to concern and to discussions, and led to specific language policy interventions from about 1990, but not to very much research. One can say the interventions originated from an experience of English as “getting closer” by becoming visible in Norway in new ways and new contexts. Recently, however, we have seen a substantial increase in research both on language use in immigrant related groups and on the relationship between Norwegian and English.

Today, the situation has changed in a somewhat surprising way. Around 1990, Norwegian language policy measures to limit the spread of English were criticized by the Danes for being puristic, whereas today, Danish authorities themselves are reconsidering their traditionally liberal language policy principles. Both in Denmark and in Sweden, official reports have recently proposed the establishment of a national language policy to strengthen the use of the national language in particular (*Sprog på spil*, *Mål i mun*, respectively). The Swedish report is the most far-reaching, as it includes proposals on legal regulations. In Norway, on the contrary, the authorities recently turned down a proposal from The Norwegian Language Council to establish a commission of the Swedish type. In addition, the Norwegian Parliament in 2002 abolished a regulation in the University Act which stated that in higher education, “the instruction should usually be given in

Norwegian”. This was due to concern that such a regulation might hamper what was considered to be an imperative globalization of the university and college sector.

Thus, the climate for new legislative regulations of the language use field in Norway does not seem very favourable right now. Certainly, there is an ongoing process to transform The Norwegian Language Council, the official advisory body on linguistic issues for more than thirty years, into a new kind of institution, the contours of which are only slowly emerging, and this change may lead to a new Act of Parliament. And since the conversion of the Language Council marks the end of a one-hundred-year-old state language policy which has been controversial and also criticized for its results, a new Act may well become less ambitious than the former Language Council Act. Now, all the aspects of this cannot possibly be assessed seriously without paying regard to the various language political tensions that may affect the result, but at any rate, the authorities now do have the opportunity to take stock and develop some new perspectives by viewing all the aspects of language policy and globalization in a broader context.¹

The language policy measures carried out in Norway about 1990 were mainly designed to influence people’s attitudes. Advertisements, newspaper, radio and television campaigns, and written materials on language-policy issues distributed to the schools, targeted the population in general and warned against what was called “unnecessary” and “harmful” use of English. These measures were implemented by The Norwegian Language Council and had in many ways been conceived in a language policy tradition stemming from the era of nation-building. The borrowing of English linguistic matter was naively seen as a hazard to the existence of the Norwegian language and the actions also tried to fan a kind of traditional cultural struggle in favour of the language. In a way, this was both puristic and moralistic.

Today it is evident that any new language policy measures should be built more systematically on research, which means that there is a need for a better platform of knowledge than what has been available. The language policy measures just mentioned had a weak scientific basis, and there is little evidence that they have affected the causes of the spread of English in the way they were intended to. On the contrary, one can say that English is more often to be seen and heard in Norway today than it was ten or fifteen years ago. At the same time, a conception of English as “getting closer” is really rather vague. What is this metaphor meant to imply, and how could we possibly measure the progression in such a process? To these questions, we have no splendid answers, and so the whole foundation for concern on behalf of Norwegian also remains vague. Actually, the national language seems to prevail as usual in most areas.

Domains and loss of domains

A theory of “loss of domains” has been discussed in Scandinavia during the last fifteen years and can be regarded as the most important bid up to now. Essentially, this perspective was introduced in the late 1980s though initially without making use of the term “domain” (Teleman 1989). Whereas especially Norwegians had been preoccupied with what appeared to be an increasing amount of English loanwords, the theory of loss of domains led to more focussing on another perspective: the possibility that the national language may fall out of use in important societal sectors, thus giving way to English. In Denmark and Sweden, too, this was considered a more serious reason for

¹ In the autumn of 2004, a group was appointed and given the task of writing a strategic paper for the new language institution of Norway. This paper is supposed to be presented in the autumn of 2005, and so it seems that the wish of The Norwegian Language Council for a linguistic commission in a way will come true after all.

concern than the importation of English linguistic elements, and so it attracted interest in all of Scandinavia.² One can assume that the theory of loss of domains has played an important part in the above mentioned language policy re-orientation in Denmark and Sweden.

Now, a closer examination reveals that even the theory of loss of domains is a problematic one. Below, I shall deal rather briefly with this, to show why this perspective in my opinion should be nuanced and supplemented with other scientific and methodological approaches.

The current use of the notion of “domain” stems from Joshua Fishman (1972). Fishman’s contributions belong to the sociolinguistic tradition of the sociology of language, which gives priority to descriptions and analyses of social conditions by means of linguistic data and to the interpretation of linguistic variation as expressions of social phenomena. His theory of domains should be regarded as an early attempt to combine three aspects which seem to be important in relation to language choice, i.e. *interlocutors*, *topic* and *locale*. In Fishman’s view, these three elements work together to give the speakers a feeling that a specific language will be *appropriate* in a given situation, making them choose exactly that language.

It is easy to see that these three elements pointed out by Fishman correspond to factors that attract the attention of many sociolinguists. This is not least true of “interlocutor(s)” and “locale”. If we include network models, too, the “topic” aspect falls into place as well, since such models assume exactly that the social world of language users, including their subject matters, influence their language use. The domain model also touches on accommodation theories, which stress the importance of interlocutors in relation to linguistic adaptation, and Fishman’s notion of “interlocutor” also includes what he calls “role-relations”. Furthermore, the domain notion presupposes the perspectives of both intra-individual and inter-individual variation and maybe even the existence of registers as a part of speakers’ linguistic competence. At the same time, it presupposes a theory of context dependent variation, even though “locale” cannot be said to correspond completely to “situation”, by actually postulating the co-variation of three factors – saying that people and places and “social topics” occur together in fixed combinations.

So Fishman’s notion of “domain” is a formalized model which appears to both presuppose and integrate or contain a number of other perspectives on spoken language. This model is advanced and interesting. How well rooted it is in empirical evidence I wouldn’t dare to say, but sociologists of language adhere to it as a perspective on oral language use. What about the political notion of “domain loss”, then? In an article³, I have tried to show that Fishman’s notion of domain has very little in common with the domain loss notion from Scandinavian debates on language policy. The most problematic issue, which makes it rather difficult to link the two notions, is that Fishman’s discussions relate to domains in a context of *spoken language* and *the language choices of multilingual minority language speakers from among different languages which they master in principle equally well*, whereas the debates on “loss of domains” in Scandinavia are about Scandinavian majority language users who seem to drop their mother tongue in favour of English even when, or especially when *writing*. I will return to this below.

² The situation in relation to domain loss and language policy measures carried out in the Nordic countries was mapped for each country separately in 2001 due to an initiative from The Nordic Council of Ministers. Höglén (2002) gives an account of the results. Some of the mappings suffer from a too loose notion of “domain” and tend to be compilations of casual and incommensurable information stemming from rather heterogeneous sources.

³ This article exists in two versions, respectively Simonsen (2001) and Simonsen (2002). The latter in Norwegian is an elaborate version of the former, which was presented at a European Language Year seminar.

Accordingly, this discussion includes both spoken and written language, indeed maybe first and foremost the latter, and therefore a much broader approach is needed than what is usual in classical sociolinguistic investigations of spoken language variation alone. In my opinion, the domain notion as developed by Fishman fails to cover this. On the other hand, it may function well exactly in relation to *spoken language*, but then in a somewhat looser version which specifies more approximately the relationship between the three aspects, just the way it is explained in introductions to sociolinguistics and in terminology surveys.⁴

Some interesting attempts have been made to develop the notion of domain to make it fruitful in relation to written language too, in other words to bridge the gap between Fishman's notion and the language political use of "loss of domains". Ragnhild Ljosland (2003) bases a recent investigation of language use and language attitudes among Norwegian PhD candidates on a more advanced model, developed by Richard B. Baldauf jr. og Björn Jernudd. It includes a number of supplementing elements such as networks, societal expectations etc. in addition to Fishman's classical three to launch an "expanded" notion of domain. On the basis of this model, she studies the practice and the attitudes of the candidates systematically. In Scandinavian language policy, one should look forward to further discussions on these issues on the basis of new investigations both of Ljosland's kind and with the use of other methodological approaches.

What weighs against a domain notion that aims at covering both spoken and written language, is the completely different relationship that exists between the sender, the message and the recipient in the two settings and, consequently, between interlocutors, topic and locale. Where written language is used neither the "locale" nor the "recipient" can retain the same meaning as in the context of conversations, and texts dispatched by an author very often can become available to anyone, anywhere, which in turn is likely to influence choices you make as a "sender", etc. In addition, writing means contributing to a strongly institutionalized literacy community (school system, public administration, mass media including publishing houses, formal and stylistic demands based on genres and traditions, a technology that requires investments, etc.). A domain perspective designed to cover both this and spoken language may lock us up in analogies that are striking, but still provide us with limited insight.

This may prove especially important now that some of the institutional frames of written language are in a phase of change in connection with the development of data technology and the entry of hypertext, i.e. new Internet-based media. New written practices "marked" by oral language in that they are elusive and informal (home pages, e-mail, chat groups) seem to emerge, and a reorganization of the relationship between written and spoken language may be taking place as users alternate actively and quickly between media such as SMS messages and mobile telephone calls. If this relationship really is getting more dynamic than it used to be, then it becomes even more imperative to maintain a perspective that attends to both coherence and difference and here, an "extended" domain notion is not necessarily well suited.

A simplified perspective

The discussion of domains is a methodological one, a debate that has been necessary and probably will remain so. In my opinion, Fishman's domain notion is interesting, but should be reserved for oral language use. Below I will base my discussion on a somewhat simplified perspective. Referring to the conception that English is "getting closer" in Norway, we can specify the content of this

⁴ Cf. for example Richards, Platt and Weber (1987).

metaphor by means of a thought that lies implicitly at the bottom of Fishman's theory: *that there are "mental linguistic borders" which speakers can cross by switching to another language, even when they could just as well have continued to express themselves in the "initial language"*. Such borders cannot be shown on a map, but exist as options "within" the individual and can be realized in social encounters almost anywhere, geographically speaking, but still only under specific circumstances (depending upon interlocutor, topic and locale), according to Fishman.⁵

Without following Fishman's reasoning to the end, we can see both internal and external conditions that need to be fulfilled if borders of this kind are to be established (and thereby be possible to cross, also). These conditions are partly individual-subjective and partly intersubjective-objective. To specify: To the extent that Norwegian-speaking Norwegians (i) become *bilingual* in English and Norwegian, (ii) attain *arenas* (more or less institutionalized "locales" or "meeting places")⁶ which make both languages equally available, and (iii) get *motives* to choose English – to the same extent they will have approached the "linguistic option border" between Norwegian and English, both internally and externally.⁷ In this perspective, then, we should say that Norwegian speakers "get closer" to English, rather than vice versa – but as I have argued (Simonsen 2002:8), we should also say at the same time that *English* conquers domains in Norway (and not that Norwegian loses domains). Now, whether there are domains of the Fishman kind or not and whether they include oral language solely or not, we can imagine how domains come into existence – that their beginning may be in bilingualism, arenas or motives.

Let us now have a look at the two sub-fields "adolescent use of English in Norway" and "the use of English in Norwegian academic communities of knowledge" while keeping those three conditions in mind. I would like to stress that these two sub-fields have *not* been selected on the assumption that they can be grouped and compared without reservation.⁸ On the contrary, the groups involved – young Norwegians in general and university and academy employed scholars – are on the one hand heterogeneous, on the other hand they differ so much in age, societal position etc. that precisely a collated discussion of the two sub-fields in question may shed light on the total field of Norwegian and English language use in Norway and show how extensive and complex it indeed is. But they also share the position of being conceived as "gateways" for English language and are language planning sectors to which The Norwegian Language Council gives preference as well. Finally, the university system makes the involved groups touch because it attracts growing numbers of young adults as students.

⁵ In my understanding, then, one doesn't cross this kind of "linguistic option border" by switching to another language to make oneself understood. One does it only by *changing without any compelling reasons*.

⁶ The term "arena for language use" was launched by me (Simonsen 2001:44) to substitute "domain" in contexts where whole societal sectors are seen as language use arenas. Thus, my use of this term stems from a critique of the language policy marked use of Fishman's term. However, I have used it figuratively as well to denote any "place" with a fairly permanent existence where language is used in contact between people.

⁷ One must distinguish between the dropping of Norwegian and more occasional use of English, for example code-switching and the use of loanwords, which is often more symbolic than communicative and occurs within settings that are linguistically Norwegian. This kind of English use can be observed in many social groups including adolescents and researchers.

⁸ Whereas "adolescent" is an age category that includes *everybody* born within a specific period of time, "academic scholars" is a collective term based primarily on profession and after that on education, and so it also has social implications (class character). Consequently, there is a casual relationship between the two categories.

Youth language, media and subcultures

A general reason for taking an interest in youth language is the presumption that adolescents are language development pioneers, so that today's youth language may become tomorrow's general language. On this basis there are good reasons for studying more specifically young people's use of English for communicative and symbolic purposes as well as their attitudes to English and to their own mother tongue. As a matter of fact, we have lately seen a flourishing of this kind of research both in Norway and in the other Scandinavian countries, to a large degree inspired by work in Great Britain (Pedersen 2000:44ff). This research is frequently based on interactional sociolinguistics, where linguistic variation is studied in the context of social interaction (and thus also stresses individual and social motives), and it has produced some very interesting results.

Very often young people are exposed to competing language norms which may stem from their parents, their friends, the media etc. They may also have moved with their family from one dialect region to another and have to relate to this as well as to other social circumstances in their lives. Their social, and linguistic, development may also be influenced in a decisive manner by gender and social and cultural background. Thus, they are in a fundamental sense "diffuse" and innovation orientated. Youth language, however, is not at all a passive product of external influence solely. Adolescence is a period of identity-making, and this clearly also applies to the development and use of linguistic varieties, attitudes etc., as we shall soon see. In this context, naturally, both active and passive use of the media is an important field of study which calls for critical investigation.

We should, however, bear in mind that this is all about a particular phase of life, so we had better abstain from exaggerating the importance of the special traits of young people's language and their use of English, since their practice may change as they grow up and enter a new phase in life.

Now let us return to adolescent linguistic pioneering. The most remarkable general trend in today's spoken Norwegian is the emergence of new, regional dialects in major parts of the country. This makes up a general sociolinguistic background for analyses of language use, and here, we can assume that young people most likely pioneer by being the first to make use of the new, regional linguistic features. In addition, this linguistic regionalization is no doubt connected with domestic migrations and thus, on this basis, we may regard "new mobility" as a common denominator for what is taking place in Norway and the world, where crowds of migrants, in much larger numbers, make up a characteristic element. If this comparison is true the participation of young people in both dialect levelling and a "glocalised" youth culture (i.e. with both global and local orientation at the same time), which fluctuates linguistically between their mother tongue and English, a culture spread especially through the media, can materially be linked to new urbanization and migration – and ideologically perhaps to modernization and the introduction of common national and international frames of reference (as proposed by Mæhlum 2002).

These processes testify to considerable dynamics, and even though we definitely do not know whether we are heading towards stable new patterns of language use or not, the new regional spoken varieties do not seem to displace older varieties but rather to join them and supplement them (whether these varieties are local geographical dialects or spoken standards). Consequently, groups of young Norwegian speakers have the opportunity to switch between new regional varieties and traditional dialects and also use more specific "youth varieties" as we shall see.

Due to increased immigration, young Norwegian speakers now more frequently take part in linguistic interaction with adolescents with a different linguistic background. But not very many of

the latter have English as their mother tongue, and so there are few indications that Norwegian adolescents very often find themselves in social contexts where choosing or even using another language is an option.⁹ Thus, there is no language shift away from Norwegian, of course not. On the contrary, we can assume that there is a rather comprehensive transition *into* Norwegian, namely among adolescents with an immigrant background and with Punjabi, Urdu, Turkish, Spanish etc. as their home languages.

All in all, considerable groups with an immigrant background now live in Norwegian townships, such as in Oslo, where they put their stamp on certain parts of the town and are linguistically noticeable inside the classrooms as well. Of course, this is but a part of a larger Western European pattern. In Norway, the existence of new spoken “youth varieties” of the national language linguistically marked by immigrants seems to be less well documented than in Sweden and Denmark (cf. “Rinkebysvenska”, “Copenhagen multi-ethnolect”) , but in time, inquiries into youth language use in the towns of Norway will most likely produce the same results as in the two neighbouring countries, namely that ethnically and linguistically mixed groups develop such varieties, available even to young Norwegians without an immigrant background.¹⁰

Researchers regard the new varieties as results of identity-making processes where young people – to use a popular poststructuralist term – “negotiate” identity and relationships by examining and drawing up borderlines by means of speech acts and by code-switching, “crossing” (which means traversing the border to a language that, strictly speaking, doesn’t “belong” to oneself, to attain special effects), developing new varieties etc. What is interesting in our context, then, is the opportunity provided to observe how new “mixed varieties” emerge or are being developed in real life and, thus, how linguistic changes take place. Closer examinations may even confirm that this is equivalent to observations of how new social forms emerge in and through language.

The domain notion is designed to fit the context of choice between different *languages*. If we transfer it to choices between *varieties*, it isn’t always evident whether the new immigrant language marked youth varieties should be regarded as dialects or as registers solely (Pedersen 2000:52ff) but this doesn’t have to be a decisive issue either.¹¹ In any case, it is exactly here – in a discussion on alternation between different variants of *spoken* language – that a domain perspective seems the most relevant and could possibly shed some light on the factors that determine the choice in a given situation. One may regard the development of new varieties as an expression of the emergence of both new social arenas and new motives.

In addition to dialect regionalization and new cross-ethnic linguistic contact, there is a third dynamic field where, in our context, it seems highly relevant to view the language and the language use of Norwegian adolescents in the light of the international linguistic development, and this third field is how young people use the *media*. It is well known that both boys and girls are eager

⁹ Actually, even code-switching to English may to be less frequent among adolescents than in other groups of Scandinavians. Harriet Sharp (2001:189ff) indicates this for Sweden, comparing a spoken youth language corpus with recordings from a number of business meetings in a Sweden-based shipping company.

¹⁰ The Nordic youth language research project “Språkkontakt og ungdomsspråk i Norden” (<http://www.uib.no/uno/>) was recently finished, and has produced several studies from the Nordic countries including a number by the Norwegian Inger Kristine Hasund (2002), who discusses varieties like “Kebab Norwegian”, “Salsa Norwegian” etc. (which I conceive to be tentative terms). At present, there is some delay in Norwegian research in this field.

¹¹ A simplified definition of “dialect” may be that it is a variety of a language spoken by a specific group and different from other varieties of the same language spoken by other groups. Similarly, “style” may be said to be variations belonging to an individual’s linguistic competence, variations that the individual applies for instance in specific situations. Cf. Richards, Platt and Weber (1987:80; 243; 277), headwords “dialect”, “register” and “style”.

consumers of the programmes supplied by the media, the range of which has been remarkably extended during the last decades. One also assumes that the mass media have a considerable linguistic influence, especially by passing on new words and phrases, and that they play an important role by dispersing linguistic matter from English and positive attitudes to English in particular. Thus, to us this is a most interesting field of study, for some of the most conspicuous traits of young people's linguistic varieties are moulded right here – i.e. not the varieties themselves, but the elements of English in youth language in general and the ways they function.

In a qualitative in-depth inquiry into a number of US inspired subcultures in Denmark (hip-hop, data, rock etc.), conducted by Bent Preisler together with culture sociologist Kjeld Høgsbro, one of the conclusions is that English coming “from the bottom” is a decisive force in the spread of English in Denmark (Preisler 1999:231ff). This is about both ideological and linguistic impulses which to a great extent emanate from the subcultures. English linguistic matter spreads from the core groups to the layers of “wannabes” before it is passed on to all adolescents and all of society, via the mass media, and in particular into the arena of marketing. My reading of this is that subcultures create much of the dynamics characterizing the adolescents' relationship to English, since those groups see themselves as being in opposition to the establishment and thus can be said to have an international or even internationalist orientation. English words and phrases have an intrinsic value, and knowing and using them means mastering an internal code, and serves as a means of social climbing, which is associated with specific (American) social idols and integrated in “tales of conquest”, around which the cultures are built.

Now, research into hip-hop culture and language (Androutsopoulos 2003, Androutsopoulos and Scholz 2003) has broadened this perspective on subcultures and language by specifying and supplementing the picture given by Preisler and Høgsbro. This is done by pointing out more precisely how the dialectics between the participant groups functions, in particular in rap music, which is a part of the hip-hop movement that during the last two decades has taken over much of rock music's role as a leading oppositional music style and a cultural form of expression among young people. Now, the strong international impulses which emanate from this subculture and spread via the Internet, television etc. in no way mean a farewell to the local settings. On the contrary, they are refracted and strongly transformed in the local context, linguistically too (a trend that not only testifies to the social orientation of hip-hop culture but also to its great flexibility, thereby shedding light on its strengths). At a certain point of time, French, German, Italian, Norwegian and even Indonesian artists started rapping in their mother tongue, whether this happened to be their national language or a dialect thereof or some other variety. This is, in other words, a twofold (or manifold) process of simultaneous rebellion and adaptation which may seem to produce more new local differences than world-wide assimilation.

Of course, the background of this is to a great extent material and technological: Commercial satellite television has linked the youth of the world more closely than ever before. Secondly, the Internet has given major youth groups in many countries new media, and thereby arenas, for the use of written language – e-mail, chat groups, home pages etc. – and radically new access to direct participation in a global pop culture where English is the dominant language, thereby clearly creating new motives for using this or that language in specific contexts, too. In turn, this has led to a cultural flourishing that also implies a new local orientation (also named “glocalization”).

Jannis Androutsopoulos (2003) also analyzes text making and text use in rap music (and pop culture) and the dialectics between the groups involved, on the basis of a threefold model originating from theories of television culture. He states that there are three different spheres, each

with their own types of texts: (i) the artists' primary texts, including song texts, video clips, CD booklets etc., (ii) (professional) secondary texts, like reports and reviews by critics, interviews etc. and (iii) tertiary texts or fan texts, i.e. fan talk, singing after the idol, group discussions, personal home pages etc. Between the participants in the different spheres there is mutuality and dialogue, with impulses moving in both directions, and a tendency for "intermediality", a complex relationship that Androutsopoulos names "vertical intertextuality". In these contexts new linguistic conventions emerge, for example orthographical innovations inspired by American Black English (like "da boyz" = "the boys"), which play an important part and are also transferred to Norwegian and other languages.

Certainly, this is interesting in more than one way. First, adolescents are not at all just passive receivers of cultural and linguistic impulses, but rather active linguistic creators. They use and reuse and also take part in the creation of texts within a context of interaction between a global culture and a domestic social and cultural foundation. This implies at the same time that they develop their English language competence. Secondly, this is about introducing Norwegian into new practices *which seems to be nearly the opposite of domain loss*. Thirdly, we should look at both written and oral media together, and it is likely that future discussions of the domain notion should start right here, in the interaction between written and oral language use in new media.

To sum up this part of the discussion, one may thus say on the one hand that young people pioneer in the development of regional spoken varieties, and also develop their own "youth varieties", varieties that sometimes have an ethnic stamp. Here, they no doubt take part in developing Norwegian. On the other hand, they make up precisely that group which picks up English words and phrases and passes them on into Norwegian. But they do not thereby drop Norwegian, which they speak most of the time, as a matter of fact. They do not cross any linguistic borders, but make extensive use of English linguistic matter, which, however, is basically designed for the symbolic universe of the social stage more than for communicative purposes, if we can distinguish clearly between the two in connection with young people's social life.

The development of youth language raises several interesting issues, both scientific and language political in nature. On a scientific basis, one could examine more clearly the symbolic value of English among the adolescents and ask them whether they experience any conflict between an attitude to English that may be very positive, and the limited opportunities for speaking English in practice, and how they think this will turn out in the future. Among the language policy issues, we find the question about media, money and social power and whether language use in this field could or should be legally regulated by the state to reduce the influence of English.

For if there is one single factor that may give rise to anxiety on behalf of Norwegian, it is this strongly positive symbolic value that English has got. Already, the question of why young people don't use English *more* than they actually do is quite as important as why they do use English.

Academic communities of knowledge

Of course, there are also several reasons for taking an interest in language and language use among those groups that work with scientific subjects at an academic level, such as researchers etc., to whom I have referred by the collective term *academic communities of knowledge*. Academics traditionally belong to the elite and thereby to the powerful, and they have come to play a gradually more important part as knowledge providers and suppliers of conditions in political and public debates. Finally, they are identified as key groups in a state policy of globalization that breaks away

from much traditional thinking but is still resolutely implemented. In the development of the new social mobility pursued by the authorities, the academics are in the front.

Norway has a rather strong tradition for university system studies, and gradually, several studies of language use within this sector have also been presented.¹² But before we take a closer look at this it appears to be fruitful to view the whole field in a general analytical perspective since this may enable us to assess scientific results and their implications more clearly.

The Norwegian communities of knowledge are made up of tens of thousands of people engaged in very complex activities including text production on a considerable scale. Basically, these activities are carried out within politically determined, and *managed*, frames, today mostly through globalization measures. In particular, international orientation and international mobility are pushed, since this is considered necessary to ensure scientific quality, and in addition, because it confirms ideological conceptions of the “knowledge society” and of international cooperation as an arena for competition, where you have to prove yourself. The decision to do away with the regulation which gave preference to Norwegian as the usual language of instruction, then, was an intervention from the central political power basis of society. In addition, the knowledge communities are managed at lower levels, both through self-management at the institutions and by customers, company managements etc. (where research is carried out on a business basis).¹³

The communities of knowledge are complex, and here I would like to make use of a model developed by the Norwegian sociologist Ragnvald Kalleberg (2004). According to Kalleberg, an academic discipline is made up of a bundle of five different types of activities, and the academic professionals will relate to a set of roles corresponding to this while having access to five different types of linguistic interactions:

As a *researcher*, the professional (at least) talks with researchers within his or her special field, as a *teacher* with students, as a *disseminator* and *public debater* with interested laymen (non-specialists), as an *expert* with clients and other users and as a *colleague or institution member* with other members (or relevant persons outside the institution). (Kalleberg 2004:89) [translated here from Norwegian into English by DFS]

Specific studies and analyses of language use will vary quite a lot depending on what type of activity one happens to deal with, and there cannot exist only one academic “domain”. For example, scientific publishing is involvement in subject-related discourses between (frequently) highly specialized researchers, whereas expert activity tends to be something external, taking place outside the academic groups and in interaction with outsiders as well, so that the language choices

¹² The research institute NIFU STEP, previously known as The Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education (NIFU), has provided knowledge about this field for decades and has documented a generally increasing tendency among Norwegian researchers to publish in English. In addition, Norway has a tradition for extensive general reports on power in society where elites and other powerful groups, including academic elites, are critically studied on a scientific basis. One such report recently made some comments on the relationship between power and language, certainly in rather general terms, applying a kind of “neo-colonialism critical” view on the relationship between English and Norwegian. Even a number of university based researcher groups (in Oslo led by Professor Stig Johansson) carry out studies in this field. And recently, The Norwegian Language Council has supported some studies in language use and language attitudes among academics (Ljosland 2003, Schwab 2004, Schwach 2004).

¹³ This character of managed-ness seems to collide with the traditional idea of academic freedom, especially that of scientific freedom, and may of course be regarded as a real, alarming disruption of a critical balance of power, but it does not necessarily have to be, since academic activities are not – or at least used not to be – controlled in detail. Mostly, political management of academic activities is a question of framework conditions that may influence processes and results without making the involved persons feel tied or bound.

obviously may turn out rather differently according to whether the context is, say, consultations at a Norwegian hospital or a classification of ships in China. We know little about this, but may presume there is a main pattern where Norwegian is used in contact with Norwegian (Scandinavian?) customers or clients and English is used in other contexts.

Regarding scientific publishing, it has been shown that 80 percent of the contributions written by university employed Norwegian researchers during the years 1998–2000 were in non-Scandinavian languages (mainly English) compared to 65 percent in the period 1979–81 (Kyvik 2001:15f). This is the only activity where there is solid evidence for a transition from Norwegian to English over time in academic contexts. Now, it also turns out that such numbers have been rather stable with regard to natural sciences and other disciplines with a well-established international culture, so that the transition into English takes place first and foremost within the social sciences and after that within the humanities where Norwegian used to hold a strong position as a language for scientific purposes (cf. also Schwach 2004:28ff for a more detailed description).

How should we interpret this? It can easily be shown that the transition to more frequent publishing in English is due to specific changes in media use since Norwegian researchers now switch to writing more articles for international journals, frequently in collective authorship with foreigners (Kyvik 2001:12f; 16f). No doubt these media are new arenas, and if we look for motives for this transition we may find them in systems for promotion by merit, international agreements on cooperation etc. But let us now view scientific publishing in connection with another activity in the discipline bundle, namely *dissemination of knowledge*. The dividing line drawn by Kalleberg between research and dissemination is clarifying: Whereas the researcher within his knowledge community is faced with a circle of peers, his colleagues in a very specialized sense, research based dissemination is about the *transmission of knowledge to people who lack the kind of specialized knowledge that the disseminator himself has got*.¹⁴ And we all are laymen once outside our specialized field, a fact that clearly is rich in practical consequences.

So in theory, there is a “division of labour” between publishing and dissemination. In fact, one can argue that a lot of Norwegian research *should* be published in English because this is the best way to ensure both a broad foundation and a high quality. No scientific knowledge can remain private, and all findings must be presented to one’s fellow researchers for evaluation. This functions as a broad profession-based public sphere where the scholars collectively take responsibility for the results.¹⁵ But if the knowledge is to be for the benefit of society, the results will have to be made public. Therefore, dissemination of knowledge can be expected to have an audience primarily in the general public sphere, which in Norway understands and speaks Norwegian. In this way, the division of labour can be expected to correspond to a particular linguistic distribution: publishing in English, but dissemination of knowledge in Norwegian.

¹⁴ For the time being, this is hardly a generally accepted definition, but it underlies a programme for dissemination of knowledge set up for the University of Oslo. A considerable confusion still prevails as to what *dissemination* means (Kalleberg 2004:85ff), even though all university institutions in Norway are obliged to carry out this.

¹⁵ An instructive discussion of why scientific results should be secured on the broadest possible basis is given by Gunnar Sivertsen (2004). Moreover, international communities of knowledge are very heterogeneous with regard to size and probably also when it comes to discipline exerting forces. Within some fields, they may well resemble infinite public sphere, whereas in other fields they are made up by limited networks of people who know each other more or less (acquaintances based on scientific contact). The degree of anonymity may influence the linguistic practice of the participants, which perhaps could be studied on the basis of both Fishman’s domain theory and theories of language and social networks. This is a methodologically interesting field where factors like linguistic competence, attitudes, media, ambitions, systems for promotion etc. also may be examined together.

Even if the research is conducted in a university sector marked by a reorganizing process with social aspects as well (new mobility and new structures), the transition to more frequent publishing in English doesn't necessarily rest on social or material motives, but may well be rooted in scientific ethics and methodology. When researchers in the humanities and social sciences make this transition, it can be considered necessary on the basis of science's own rationale: When research is globalized the number of peers increases, and then one has to use the language with the widest range of understanding to make the system work. On the other hand, scientific research clearly has ideological and material aspects as well and publishing in English is in no way equally called for in all disciplines, or all contexts, in particular not where the research has its main foundation in Norwegian culture or society.¹⁶

Based upon the principle that knowledge should be generally available and on the close connection between knowledge and the democratic formation of opinion, then, one should expect dissemination in Norwegian – maybe even to the same great extent as publishing in English, relatively. But this is hardly the situation today, and we should ask why. Why is the dissemination of knowledge in Norway an activity mostly carried out by individuals and individual institutions and therefore more scattered and casual than the rest of activities in the discipline bundle? Why do not the authorities link dissemination directly to the university funding systems as they now do with publishing and instruction? The answer is not necessarily that Kalleberg's model is wrong, but clear and binding language policy decisions may be needed to make a Norwegian language "knowledge market" start working. If so, the state should promote dissemination very actively and establish good systems for promotion by merit. As far as I know, neither the scale of the current dissemination nor the possible future "market potential" has been mapped. If this were done, we would get to know whether or not systematic dissemination of knowledge really would give new motives for the use of Norwegian at universities and colleges.

A key field in the globalization of this sector, and therefore in our context, too, is *instruction*. It is exactly here that the question of linguistic competence (and many social aspects of globalization and language use as well) is made topical. Actually, increased mobility across national borders is an important political goal. We really lack good studies of language use within this part of the discipline bundle, but the signals coming suggest that instruction in English is now introduced on a large scale in major parts of the sector.¹⁷ The institutions are expected to attract foreigners and offer English-based arrangements, and since it is easy to measure participation and throughput one can understand why this sub-field has become so important and why the former regulation on the language of instruction could be perceived as a threat to these processes. There is a great demand for better English training of both teachers and students, and this is considered to be of critical importance.

¹⁶ Some of the knowledge communities which are not primarily international may well benefit from being globalized anyhow, whereas others will hardly ever attract more than national interest. In the humanities and in social sciences in particular there are some disciplines mainly oriented towards Norway, and a lot of *applied* science is carried out, especially studies in Norwegian society conducted by non-university research institutes, which in general haven't been very much investigated themselves. Now, if the use of English goes up in such contexts as well one should ask why and also ask whether it might not be based on subject-matter related elements.

¹⁷ The Norwegian Department of Education and Research in 2003 turned down a proposal from The Norwegian Language Council to register the language of instruction at higher institutions systematically in a data base for national records on higher education. Still, this was no surprise and should possibly be understood as a sign of a temporary limited insight in the problematics. From Sweden there are data, though more than ten years old. See Gunnarsson (2001) for a discussion of these data and the general situation at Swedish universities in the 1990's.

Here it is striking, though not very surprising, to see how the authorities actively promote instruction in English on a large scale in Norwegian institutions, a practice which cautiously may be characterized as *experimenting* with instruction in a foreign language, without having studied in advance how this will or can work. Contributory to this could be the fact that it is easier to manage instruction than research, and this applies both at a higher level (through programmes, curricula etc.) and in more specific contexts (like classroom teaching).

This field is marked by tensions and conflicts, and statements about effective communication and wishes to take part in international scientific development often clash with a limited foreign language competence among students as well as teachers. The future model may prove to be a distribution where the instruction is given in the national language at the bachelor level but in English at the master level, an idea which was supported by a number of Nordic university professionals at a conference in Oslo in June 2004 (cf. <http://www.sprakrad.no/templates/Page.aspx?id=7385> for a summary in Norwegian of the debates at this conference).

Now, the general relevance of teaching in our context depends upon its form. The instruction is not free, in particular not as seen from the students' angle, since it is organized to achieve some knowledge goal and since the teacher can arrange this more or less on the basis of his own wishes and needs, so that the students do not necessarily have a "language choice". Traditional classroom teaching is mostly one-way communication, which in various ways limits the linguistic interaction (and the students' chance to pick up the content). Contrary to this, several dialogue-based types of teaching, such as project work, tend to be much more interesting as they allow the students to make their own choices and reveal the social aspects of language use in teaching activities more clearly. A popular method which up to now has been applied mainly in secondary school, but at present enters the university sector as well, is the language immersion inspired model where the pupils or students are supposed to "swim" in English, and all the instruction is given in the foreign language. For several reasons, however, this will hardly prove to be the kind of linguistic educational magic wand that some people certainly hope.¹⁸

However, the most interesting academic function in our setting all in all seems to be the role of the *colleague* or *institution member*.¹⁹ This activity, which may also be named "discipline-related self-administration", in a way makes up the frame around all the other activities in the discipline-bundle. Thus it becomes the most comprehensive and most multilateral arena, of course, and a correspondingly manifold role, but researchers, teachers, disseminators and scientific experts are members equally and take part in this kind of activity which reaches from discipline-related issues and discipline development over university administration and university politics to colleague relations at the job and networks and external relations.

Institutions, departments etc. make up social and cultural worlds where both conflicts and group pressure emerge, where alliances and networks are built, where discipline or profession related cultures are developed as well as self-images, and where power games of many kinds are played. As a matter of fact, those organizations are and probably have to be arenas for "struggles of content",

¹⁸ An arrangement of this kind at The University of Oslo is described by Roald and Stray Pedersen (2004). For a critical and more thorough discussion of experiences with language immersion models in the Swedish school, see Hyltenstam 2004.

¹⁹ Here, I understand the notion of "colleague" or "organization member" rather broadly: In my reading, it covers any role that does *not* include research, knowledge dissemination, teaching or expert activity. In other words, it covers all the heterogeneous practices at the institution that involve all groups from professors down to fellows, and in particular it covers participation in a national and an international research and education bureaucracy.

fought on both teaching methods, curricula, research profiles, cooperation arrangements and other issues linked to this particular discipline or profession culture. Subject or discipline issues are interwoven with social issues. In addition, “discipline-related self-administration” also includes – if I have understood Kalleberg correctly – the social life “backstage” which means it is here we can observe the involved academic groups in freer linguistic self-expression and may even compare them with the adolescents we have described.

So researchers who want to study the linguistic practice and language attitudes of academic professionals in a social context, should start here. However, up to now, we have no major studies from this field, neither of well-established academics in the role of colleague or institution member nor of how such community or institution cultures are built up. What we do have are studies of students and fellows who enter established academic cultures, where we may assume that the results tell us something about the cultures in question as well. Ragnhild Ljosland (2003) observed a group of PhD candidates and found that most of them take it for granted they should write their thesis in English. In her opinion, this attitude stems mainly from their linguistic socialization into the culture at their institution. In a study by Inger-Lise Schwab (2004), a group of Business Administration master degree students are followed in a linguistic anthropological perspective. Here too, the institution clearly and strongly propagates the use of English. But even though the students interviewed argue that English will be a matter of necessity in their professional lives, their use of “buzzwords” and “business talk” according to Schwab satisfies a need for symbolic markers rather than real communicative demands.

In both Ljosland’s and Schwab’s groups, English seems to serve as a kind of “symbolic capital” (Bourdieu), and so the language use may be more or less part of a conscious combined professional and social strategy to build oneself up. It is interesting to note that this very much resembles the role of English words in youth subcultures as described by Preisler and Høgsbro. The language choice expresses social adaptation or even an act of identity, and to the PhD candidates, publishing in English implicitly gives an opportunity to show one’s professional profile and make a name for oneself. On the other hand, the students studied by Schwab know very well that they should limit their use of “buzzwords” outside the group to avoid negative responses.

Now, we shouldn’t draw too far-reaching conclusions on the basis of slender information, but one may dare to hypothesize that the use of English by self-administering academics in freer contexts can have something in common with adolescents’ use of English words and their code-switching to English – given this is a question of symbolically motivated language use in a (free) social game. However, as we know, a decisive difference at the same time is that where young people have created their own framework more or less in opposition to the establishment and make use of English in identity-making and generation revolt, university academics, for their part, act within institutional frames where informal use of English is probably less important than politically managed use of English in instruction and other discipline related academic activities. If this is true it also makes academic use of English less interesting in a certain sense since in principle it only reflects economic and political globalization on a large scale.

Is English “getting closer” in Norway?

How should we then sum up the tendencies within those parts of Norway’s current linguistic landscape that we have touched on so far? What is the situation concerning adolescent and academic use of English? Is English more “present” in these fields today than it used to be?

Let us now return to what was said in the paragraph “A problematic notion of domain”, that Fishman’s theory of domains is based upon the existence of mental “linguistic option borders” that are crossed when someone changes between two domains. I also asserted that in our context one may schematically formulate three conditions for the existence of such borders, i.e. (i) bilingualism, (ii) arenas and (iii) motives, and then study the two fields mentioned to look for tendencies showing that English is “moving closer” through the fulfilment of at least one of those conditions.

The first point, *bilingualism in English and Norwegian*, is the easiest one to comment on. Such bilingualism apparently is an aim in current Norwegian educational policy, but it is in fact more remote than most people imagine, since bilingualism is something quite different from being “good at” a language. Very few people are even close to mastering those two languages equally well. What can be stated safely, however, is that Norwegians’ active and passive *competence* in English has improved quite a lot. As we have seen, this applies to children and young people in particular, and is no doubt connected to their active use of media, and, of course, also to their learning English at school, an activity which now starts earlier than ever. Teachers often confirm that some of their pupils have a high English competence. Today, this development has been going on for so long that it also includes students and young adults.

When young people become involved in international subcultures, English linguistic matter becomes part of the social dialects. Clearly, they thereby also improve part of their English competence – familiarity with (ethnic) American youth slang, musicians’ jargon, technical terms etc., maybe even syntax and literary style as well. But they hardly become bilingual in this way.

That the kind of bilingualism aimed at by the authorities is scarce can also be seen from the fact that institutions make use of instruction in English without preceding investigations, thus forcing the students to follow or introduce language immersion inspired methods. Nor should anyone think that scientific publishing in English necessarily reflects bilingualism. But the scarcity of this kind of linguistic competence in Norway should not surprise us. To become bilingual, one has to be raised with two home languages or at least socialize closely and permanently with people of another mother tongue in contexts that are – existentially, economically, socially, culturally etc. – so important that the other language is picked up and acquired. But this presupposes large multilingual population groups which haven’t been seen in Norway.²⁰

The most important question in our context, then, is whether the increasing English competence implies that (part of) the population may be on their way to a bilingual level. In principle, it should be possible to reach such a level at an adult age as well – but whether or not the development in Norway has been going in this direction is far from clear. What the combination of better linguistic knowledge of English among children and adolescents and a progression to university instruction in English at the master level may lead to, remains an open question.

In Norway, a lot of things have definitely changed, but conditions in many respects also remain the same. All in all, the majority of what I have called *arenas for language use* are possibly made up of meeting places that have existed for a long time (even if there also *are* some important new arenas, as we have seen). Now, as defined above (cf. note 6) this category is a very heterogeneous one. To assess the development more closely, let us first distinguish between physical meeting places and

²⁰ In Norway, the real bilinguals are first and foremost Sámi speakers and then maybe immigrants of the second generation, and for both of these groups we talk about bilingualism in their mother tongue and Norwegian.

technology based (mass) media. Secondly, we can group more or less private (social) arenas together as opposed to public sphere orientated arenas.

On the one hand, many new social fora of a more traditional kind have emerged, and they make up corresponding language use arenas. This occurs when people move to new places or when newcomers move in in their own neighbourhood, and follows from the continuous social restructuring in society which involves most social groups, including, of course, both adolescents and academic professionals. On the other hand, we have seen how the new Internet-based media function as language use arenas by virtue of their new technology and favour both a global and a local orientation. Such media are, to a varying degree, used by everyone and, naturally, by young people and professionals in the university sector as well, like mobile phones, of which young people in particular are heavy users. To this must be added well-established media including broadcast media.

More permanent groups tend to be organized around a conversational “room” which in a certain sense always makes up a kind of minor “public sphere”. Still, this word becomes misleading when we come to groups that spend their time together and nothing else. Especially where the groups are organized around some specific subject or purpose (Simonsen 2001:50f) we may call them *public sub-spheres*. So we should distinguish between groups that are basically social and therefore clearly have a *private* character, and more *subject-related* communities. Both traditional meeting places and networks that are media and technology based can be used by purely social groups and sub sphere communities as well, and new and old media and meeting places clearly can be combined and can supplement each other.

For example, adolescents make use of both mobile phones and email as an integrated part of their social contact. But they also participate in more interest orientated conversation on the Internet about topics like music as described by Androutsopoulos and Scholz (2003),²¹ and researchers exchange points of view partly on the Net, partly in printed articles and partly at conferences. To the academics, the role as an institution member or a self-administrator in particular offers opportunities to take part in both formal and informal social practices, and here one may therefore find both large and small language use arenas of all the four kinds, whereas scientific publishing clearly implies conduct in a broad professional public sub-sphere – being at the same time the most important area for systematic transition to English, as we have seen.

It would be useful to have youth meeting places and networks analyzed in this perspective. I believe that young people’s communities usually are predominantly private or social, appearing only rarely to be real public sub-spheres. But I also believe that occasionally groups are formed with a public sphere orientation, especially when Internet based media are involved, because the communities may then be organized around themes. This can be important because the degree of anonymity, which in Internet contexts may be manipulated, probably affects the language use and may discipline the participants in fora of different types differently, a subject I cannot account for in more detail. As we know, adolescent linguistic practice is marked by both intra-personal and inter-personal variation, and this may be due to factors of precisely this kind.

But even if young people make creative use of the new media and heavily utilize English linguistic matter in this context, it seems that they do *not* generally have many arenas where extensive use of

²¹ To what extent young Norwegians take part in Internet fora administered from *abroad*, and write in *English* on the Net, for example tertiary texts of the kind Androutsopoulos (2003) refers to, I don’t know, but this should be mapped.

spoken and written English is an option. Contrary to academics who commonly may travel a whole lot abroad in their jobs and also may extend their social circle by receiving foreign colleagues, young people basically travel in their private lives and do not very often meet with native English speakers, and so do not very often get the opportunity to speak English for a long time themselves.²²

In other words, there are few linguistic meeting places in Norway which seem to offer people an opportunity to develop any kind of bilingualism in English and Norwegian. However, if such arenas happen to occur, it must be the Internet based rather than the traditional ones that stand out in this context, and also the public sphere orientated rather than the social fora, as we have seen. Researchers who publish on the Net will fulfil both criteria.

Where *motives* are concerned, we have seen that English elements in Norwegian youth language more often serve symbolic than communicative purposes. Large youth groups ascribe a very strong symbolic value to English according to Preisler and Høgsbro. This emanates from the subcultures and is mediated by the media, and the question is how we should interpret it. Do the young Danes and Norwegians desire to drop their mother tongue, or should this simply be considered to be part of a general youth discourse on a Danish, respectively a Norwegian linguistic basis? Is it about communicative issues at all?

Adolescents have a variety of motives for putting their stamp on language and the extent of this variety seems to have increased due to migrations, new social and ethnic groupings, extended and globalized media and an extensive spread of computers. Here, influence from the international subcultures joins with a globalized pop culture and enters into a media orientated universe where new user's technology is always available. And there are new motives for linguistic development as well, linked to geographical and social mobility and new kinds of social patterns in Norway. Most probably, the motives vary with social, cultural and gender based hierarchies, life-style, class, consumption habits etc. – but all in all, young people need Norwegian language as a social means in Norway more than they really need to cross the linguistic border to English.

Even in the academic knowledge societies, people clearly have varying motives. As mentioned before, researchers habitually need to ensure the quality of their contributions by making them available to the largest possible circuit of colleagues. In this way, scientific publishing functions as a broad public sphere where one has to use international languages. In addition, the individual researcher can profit within the university system by publishing in English. Therefore, there is here a strong twofold impulse to use English, which can explain why such use increases in this sub-field, as we know it does. On the other hand, if dissemination activities are strengthened by good systems for promotion by merit, this may give the involved professionals motives for using Norwegian, which, for the time being, is mainly hypothetical.

In several types of academic activity, motives in both directions can emerge. Thus, engagement in expert activities abroad definitely promotes English in a powerful way (but this is rather a result of compelling circumstances than of motives), whereas jobs in Norway (of course) imply motives for the use of Norwegian. Even the colleague or institution member role which can embrace all the other parts of the discipline bundle may well lead to substantially differing motives. Within this manifold activity, motives will manifest themselves for now this, now that. Since the institutions are

²² To young people with an immigrant background, Norwegian adolescents most likely occasionally also speak English. Whether the social intercourse between those two groups is influenced by the Norwegians' position as speakers of the dominant majority tongue is an interesting question to which I have no answer.

based in Norway, Norwegian would be the natural language for administration and social intercourse, but this doesn't always come through. Besides, internationalization indicates that academics involved should establish networks across the national borders and also engage in international (sub)cultures that are partly subject-related and partly social. So, they face both the need and the motives to switch between available languages.

As to instruction, this is an arrangement-marked activity which nevertheless may very well motivate teachers and students, in particular when successful. Good instruction in English will definitely strengthen one's motivation to use this language in the long run.

To summarize this discussion of linguistic competence, arenas for language use and motives, very few things indicate that the conditions for the development of bilingualism will be fulfilled in the foreseeable future. Such a development would have meant creating a situation where adolescents and university professionals may switch freely between English and Norwegian. In particular, this seems to be out of the question for young people who develop their language use in interaction with media and pop culture and relate to both domestic and international migrations, but who live and express themselves within the Norwegian linguistic community. On the other hand, linguistic development in the academic communities of knowledge is mainly produced in a political process where a restructuring of the knowledge system is a very central issue. Here, important groups get both the opportunity and the motives to make use of English, depending upon what kind of activity they are involved in, and the social aspects of this should probably be regarded as secondary compared to those that are subject-related. The very real contact across the borders causes the professionals to make "partial language shifts", if one can put it this way, i.e. a binding and lasting choice of English in some cases, in terms of time and/or space, in connection with an article, a book or a series of lectures. This may very well be interpreted as a *domain loss* (but whether it really *is* a loss of "domains" in Fishman's sense is quite another question).

With a metaphor, then, we can say that whereas Norwegian adolescents in their relationship to the world may stand gazing over what they conceive to be a fence to the big world, and dream they were there, on the other side of the fence, or that the world was here, academic professionals for their part have plenty of opportunities to climb this fence both to and fro – or rather to cross geographical and also linguistic borders, because they have been selected for such a role by the authorities and by society. But neither of the two groups is in a position that can be compared to the multilingual minority-language speakers whom Fishman described.

Still, when Norwegian academics, or even young Norwegians, make use of English we should assume that they do this for communicative reasons, to make themselves understood, not because they really belong to circles that can switch freely between the two languages and equally well could have chosen either of them. They do not cross any "linguistic option border" in the sense that I have extracted from Fishman's theory. To repeat this once again: They really aren't bilingual in English, because they seldom get into situations that could promote bilingualism, and for the same reason, the great majority of them also lack the motives for acquiring competence in a foreign language at this level. But as to linguistic competence in English, both academics and adolescents have got "closer" to English in that they read and speak it much better than before, an improvement that has taken a few decades. As opposed to young people, the academics also have got "closer" in the way that they really can go abroad, and practise their linguistic skills frequently. What this may lead to in the long run remains to be seen.

Conclusion

As I suggested in the introduction, an *overall* assessment of the situation as to language policy in Norway hasn't been an aim in this article. In that case, one would have to cover all the strong cleavages in this field, such as the general status or position of Bokmål and Nynorsk (in varieties supported by the state or private groups), state-authorized or private standardization, the social stamp of standardized speech, language use in the media, language teaching in schools, the equal status of Bokmål and Nynorsk in governmental use and immigrant languages – to mention only a few of the issues that we haven't touched on and therefore cannot comment on either. For the same reasons I have not been able to discuss possible future trends that may affect the linguistic situation, including a radically increased immigration and a thoroughgoing political regionalization in Europe.

So, basically, I will seek to assess the situation with respect to the use of English and Norwegian in two important sectors. At the same time, I will strive to take into consideration the rest of the language use field in Norway as well, thereby hoping to be able to establish a total outlook.

In what direction, then, does the linguistic development within the youth groups and the societies of knowledge point? Here, one should sketch a twofold answer, because the landscape observed is clearly twofold, too. On the one hand, there are the adolescents, who represent a general age group where a lot of later social patterns are adopted. In spite of its generation character, youth language may well give an indication of what tomorrow's general language will look like, because young people are linguistic pioneers. On the other hand, there is the university and college sector, the knowledge system, which in our context, all in all, should be counted as a *special* part of society, i.e. a "particular sector" and no general public – although politically steps have been taken to make this sector include as many as possible and apparently with some success, too.

Young people live their lives at home, at school and in social meeting places during their leisure time, and in this article, I have frankly taken for granted that the arenas for the development of youth language basically are to be found among the last-mentioned. This implies that youth language unfolds within the framework of civil society, and belongs to those sectors of life that are not managed directly by the authorities. Of course, this in turn does *not* mean that adolescent language use isn't influenced by the media, by school etc. – on the contrary, the use of media is especially important, as we have seen – but it implies that *youth language corresponds to a freedom period in one's life history*. Since there seems to be a close connection between linguistic development, identity-making and social development, i.e. development of society, youth language can hardly, any more than the general language, be regulated in detail by any single body. This is a development that simply has to take its course. Therefore, youth language is in an important sense linked to the general language. When for example young Norwegians frequently make use of English words and phrases, it seems neither tempting nor in any way realistic, to seek to restrain it.

We have seen that a considerable development is taking place in spoken Norwegian, linked to new social mobility. From what we know about young people's role in this, one can say that trends of this kind should only be dealt with in the general public sphere, and balanced there – if they are to be balanced – by the tending of Norwegian carried out by both private bodies and the authorities, through the media, the Language Council and others who in practice steward the standards (professional groups etc.), and by the teaching of Norwegian in schools. At the same time, there may very well be a kind of connection at a deeper level between adolescent linguistic variation and the role of written standards, in particular the dominant Bokmål. So for several reasons, the

dialectics between linguistic standards and adolescent linguistic practice should be studied more extensively.

As we have also seen, considerable groups of young Norwegians may now stand “at the fence to English” and they may wish to “climb over” it. At the same time, there are indeed very few English mother tongue speakers in Norway, so that English in an important sense is not “present” here at all, and the adolescents basically have few opportunities to speak English with anyone.²³ If this positive attitude to English is a problem, and one could certainly argue in favour of that, the authorities should take an open-minded stand in relation to this. In addition to strengthening the teaching in Norwegian and English (competence), they can take steps to stimulate the use of Norwegian and other languages (motives) in schools, and make sure there is a supply of media and language technology (arenas) that young people really feel give them what they need.

What is said above about the necessity of free development of youth language, combined with measures for balancing and stimulation, at the same time, naturally, represents a big challenge to the language policy of a state that seeks to promote as functional language standards as possible on the broadest possible basis of speakers’ participation. And this should not be read as a rejection in principle of more specific legal regulation of the use of English and Norwegian in society.²⁴

Even within the academic knowledge societies, a freer social life unfolds, but *the linguistic practice of those knowledge workers should definitely be viewed in the light of their professional and institutional connection*, i.e. the bundle of activities that any discipline is made up of. So, the language use here is not only *managed* in a different sense from what youth language is, but the language is also a kind of *special language*, for scientific and technical purposes – even if such language continuously irrigate the general language with words and phrases. Even more important, of course, in our context are the opportunities that the groups in question are given by the state to conduct real “language shifts” (in research, instruction, expert activity and self-administration).

Paradoxically, it may well be inside the knowledge system that clear and purposeful language policy measures are accepted, even though this was the sector where a statutory provision on language use was recently abolished because it might hamper globalization. But precisely because this sector definitely *is* still regulated, and changes are made systematically to promote not globalization alone but also *quality* (a key word), it is feasible to propose or demand – even, for example, by legal regulation – measures to ensure linguistic quality at the institutions, now that a general “language stipulation” is abolished: monitor systems to generate statistics and other data on

²³ The reason we shouldn't regard adolescents' use of English linguistic matter or their code-switching to English as an ominous token for Norwegian, is that there is hardly any general and necessary connection between loanwords and code-switching on the one hand and language shift on the other – even though in real language-shift areas we may well observe that heavy borrowing and extensive code-switching occur together with domain loss. I would say that English can hardly threaten Norwegian without first becoming (socially) dominant in Norway. To obtain this, it would have to become the mother tongue of considerable (high-status) groups, and, thereafter, it might expand if groups of Norwegian speakers under certain circumstances, such as mixed marriages, eventually turned to speaking English with their children, a decisive step in a process of language shift. Such can be observed where language shift is really taking place, but this is very far from the situation in Norway.

²⁴ If the use of English really proves to restrain the availability of knowledge, co-determination, the right of access etc. for example in working life – a large “area” that we have hardly touched on – a state that really wants to promote democracy will have to stop this, if necessary through legal regulations. But this, then, is something quite different from seeking to restrain adolescent use of English linguistic matter.

actual language use, language centres to offer translation, proof-reading and text improvement, terminological assistance, teaching in scientific writing (Norwegian and English) etc. One can boldly strive for this since everybody realizes how useful it is. In Scandinavia and Finland, a number of university units have started making their own language policy in accordance with this (cf. <http://www.sprakrad.no/templates/Page.aspx?id=7385>). Besides, one can argue politically for a strengthening of the activity of dissemination of knowledge funded by the ordinary system.

Let us now, at the very end of this article, once again take a Nordic outlook. If in Norway right now – as opposed to Sweden and perhaps Denmark – there isn't a favourable climate for extensive legal regulation of the language use field, this may seem surprising, but the real differences are clearly smaller than one should assume. What is really surprising in the *Mål i mun* report is the rather radical proposal to regulate so to speak “all” language use in Sweden by means of the very same Act of Parliament. Such an Act would hardly be passed in Norway today, but still, the language use field in Norway is, and will probably remain, relatively strongly regulated by law. What we have experienced is that a language restriction has been removed from the University Act and that the Act on the Language Council is abolished, but it may be replaced by a new Act for a new kind of language institution. Consequently, it may be reasonable to state that Norway and Sweden will take similar positions if the new proposals are adopted. The former becomes a little more liberal, the latter more restrictive. And somewhere inside this picture, Denmark probably will find its place, too.

References

- Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2003. HipHop und Sprache: Vertikale Intertextualität und die drei Sphären der Popkultur, in: Androutsopoulos, Jannis ed. *HipHop: globale Kultur – lokale Praktiken*. Bielefeld: transcript (Cultural Studies 3).
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis and Arno Scholz 2003. Spaghetti Funk: Appropriations of hip-hop culture and rap music in Europe. *Popular Music and Society* 26 (4).
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. The relationship between micro- and macro-sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when, in: Pride, J.B. and Janet Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics*. Aylesbury, Bucks: Penguin [Revised version of an article from 1965].
- Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise 2001. Swedish, English, French or German – The language situation at Swedish universities, in: Ammon, Ulrich ed. *The dominance of English as a language of science. Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hasund, Inger Kristine 2002. Gjør ungdommen hærverk på det norske språket?, in: Bjørkås, S. ed. *Kulturelle kontekster. Kulturpolitikk og forskningsformidling*, volume 1. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth 2004. Engelskan, skolans språkundervisning och svensk språkpolitik, in: Lindgren, Birgitta and Olle Josephsson, eds. *Engelskan i Sverige. Språkval i utbildning, arbete och kulturliv*. Stockholm: Småskrift utgiven av Svenska språknämnden.
- Höglén, Renée 2002. *Engelska språket som hot och tillgång i Norden*. TemaNord 561. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Kalleberg, Ragnvald 2004. Forskningsformidling, knippeinstitusjoner og norsk som fagspråk, in: Simonsen, Dag F. ed. *Språk i kunnskapssamfunnet. Engelsk – elites nye latin?*, Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk [Papers from a Trondheim conference on English use in Norwegian academic knowledge communities, November 2003].
- Kyvik, Svein 2001. *Publiseringsvirksomheten ved universiteter og vitenskapelige høyskoler*. Report no 15. Oslo: The Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education (NIFU).
- Ljosland, Ragnhild 2003. *Engelsk som akademisk språk i Norge. En domenetapsstudie*. Master degree dissertation in Nordic linguistics. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Mæhlum, Brit 2002. Hvor går vi – og hvorfor? Et forsøk på å trekke noen store linjer i utviklingen av norsk talemål, in: *Målbryting* no. 6 (reports from the project “Talemålsendring i Norge”). Bergen: Nordisk institutt, University of Bergen.
- Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket* 2002. SOU 2002:27. Stockholm: Statens offentliga utredningar.
- Pedersen, Inge Lise 2000. Ungdomssprog – dialekt eller register? En oversigt over nyere, især nordisk, ungdomssprogsforskning. *Nordlyd* 28 [Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics].
- Preisler, Bent (with a contribution by Kjeld Høgsbro) 1999. *Danskerne og det engelske sprog*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

- Richards, Jack, John Platt and Heidi Weber 1987. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Burnt Mill, Harlow: Longman .
- Roald, Borghild and Babill Stray Pedersen 2004. Ett semester bare på engelsk. Bakgrunn for og erfaringer fra en nyinnført ordning på medisinstudiet ved universitetet i Oslo, in: Simonsen, Dag F. ed. *Språk i kunnskapssamfunnet. Engelsk – elitenes nye latin?*, Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk [Papers from a Trondheim conference on English use in Norwegian academic knowledge communities, November 2003].
- Schwab, Inger-Lise 2004. Det nye forretningsspråket – eller pynteengelsk? Språklig sosialisering blant mastergradsstudenter i økonomi, in: Simonsen, Dag F. ed. *Språk i kunnskapssamfunnet. Engelsk – elitenes nye latin?*, Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk [Papers from a Trondheim conference on English use in Norwegian academic knowledge communities, November 2003].
- Schwach, Vera 2004. *Norsk vitenskap – på språklig bortebane? Et pilotprosjekt om språkbruk blant fagsamfunnet av forskere i Norge*. Report no 9. Oslo: The Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education (NIFU).
- Sharp, Harriet 2001. *English in spoken Swedish. A corpus study of two discourse domains*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis [Stockholm Studies in English] XCV.
- Simonsen, Dag F. 2001. Loss of domains in smaller national languages, in: Bente Martinussen ed. *Languages in a multilingual region. Report from CDCC seminar*, Alta: Finnmark University College .
- Simonsen, Dag F 2002. Å velge bort norsk. Om begrepene “domene” og “domenetap” anvendt på skandinaviske land. *Norsklæreren* 2.
- Sivertsen, Gunnar 2004. Om valg av språk ved vitenskapelig publisering, in: Simonsen, Dag F. ed. *Språk i kunnskapssamfunnet. Engelsk – elitenes nye latin?*, Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk [Papers from a Trondheim conference on English use in Norwegian academic knowledge communities, November 2003].
- Sprog på spil. Et udspil til en dansk sprogpolitik* 2003. Copenhagen: Kulturministeriet (<http://kum.inforce.dk/sw6567.asp>).
- Språkkontakt og ungdomsspråk i Norden (UNO). (<http://www.uib.no/uno/>) [A Nordic Project.].
- Teleman, Ulf 1989. Det nordiska språksamarbetet. Idéer och framtidsuppgifter. *Språk i Norden* [Annual publications from The Nordic Language Secretariat, <http://www.nordisk-sprakrad.no/default.htm>].
- Summary in Norwegian of the debates at a conference on “parallel-lingualism” in the Nordic university sector, Oslo, June 7–8 2004 (<http://www.sprakrad.no/templates/Page.aspx?id=7385>).

Petra Daryai-Hansen: Promoting linguistic diversity: reflections on the language policy of European language policy conferences
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
272-275
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Petra Daryai-Hansen and the Editors, 2005

Promoting linguistic diversity Reflections on the language policy of European language policy conferences

Petra Daryai-Hansen

Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde University, Denmark
pdh@ruc.dk

Abstract

To face up to the omnipresence of 'Anglo-American' (as defined in footnote 2), conferences on language policy today address the issue of promoting linguistic diversity. This especially applies to contemporary Europe. Nevertheless, these conferences, which can be regarded as a kind of laboratories or academic microcosm, do not subscribe to clear language policies. Consequently, the predominant language is here, as elsewhere, the Anglo-American. This article outlines the deep division between the postulate of linguistic diversity and reality, and is a call for soul-searching.

“[...] the paper itself expresses the paradox which it treats:
it had to be written in English.”
Hartmut Haberland (1989:937)

The official section of the international conference “The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones” was rewarding in many respects, but the conference itself cannot be seen as a linguistic contact zone. On the website of the conference, the organizers reflect on the most obvious linguistic consequence of mobility: “The main working language of the conference will be English. We acknowledge the paradox in conducting the conference in a specific language, in contrast to the conference focus on issues of multilingualism, language contact and power.”¹

1. From theory ...

One of the key issues of the language policy discourse on a contemporary European and international level is how to handle the problem of the omnipresence of English, or rather

¹ Website of the conference “The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones”, Roskilde University, May 23 – 24, 2003.

‘Anglo-American’², which appears to be gaining in strength as the inevitable European and international *lingua franca*. Even Denmark, which in contrast to countries like France and Iceland, is known for a more implicit language policy, today submits proposals for language policy action programmes.³

In the discourse, Anglo-American is increasingly characterized as the language of power on the international linguistic market. On the other hand, languages such as German, French or Swedish, are designated as powerless languages which need to be strengthened and protected.

In recent years, European language policies have led to many recommendations and declarations concerning the question how to face up to the dominance of Anglo-American. The basic statements of this European language policy discourse more or less correspond. They can be exemplified by the “Würzburg Declaration on European Language Policy”, which emerged of the international conference “European Language Policy” in Würzburg (2002).⁴

The first item of the declaration is a call for maintenance of the cultural and linguistic diversity as a basis for peace and economic prosperity in the European Union in order to guarantee its future. With this end in view, the third item recommends an intensification of language teaching programmes in the individual European education systems. The second item confronts the omnipresence of Anglo-American: “An international *lingua franca* such as English is expected to foster transnational communication but it should not replace linguistic diversity as a tertiary language.”

This language policy discourse is the result of a pan-European fear of the linguistic degradation of the countries’ own languages, and ultimately their cultural identities. This struggle is not merely linguistic and cultural, but also scientific, economic and political.⁵ Consequently, resolving the language conflict is crucial for the success of the European project. This raises the question of the adequacy and practicability of the requirements. The sceptic would ask if it is actually possible to live up to the European linguistic diversity in practice.

2. ... to practice

This is emphasised when conferences on language policy themselves fail to adopt a diverse language policy but use Anglo-American as their working language, thus effectively making Anglo-American the language of power here as well. This is also the case, when the criteria which underlie the choice of working languages are not substantiated or are substantiated, without being justified.

The sociolinguistic/sociocultural conference “The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones” considers its explicit and implicit language policy in practice. On the other hand, language policy conferences are held which claim to have a consciously

² In the German research, it is proposed to use the term ‘Anglo-American’, to underline that (British and American) English owes its status as international *lingua franca* primarily to extralinguistic reasons, that is to the growing dominance of US-American culture, science, economy and politics. Thus, it seems to be appropriate to characterize the ‘Anglicism debate’ as ‘Anglo-American debate’.

³ See *Sprog på spil – et udspil til en dansk sprogpolitik* (2003).

⁴ The “International Conference on European Language Policy” took place at the European Centre of Excellence at the University of Würzburg, Germany, June 6 – 8, 2002. A conference publication will be published.

⁵ See Phillipson (2003:70-100) for an analysis of how Anglo-American affects culture, education, science and economy.

promoting attitude towards European multilingualism, while failing to realize that these theoretical recommendations are not met inside their own microcosm.

To give an example, this paradox – tabooed in the discourse – characterized the conference “European standard languages and multilingual Europe” in Mannheim (2000). Here, the lectures and discussions were interpreted simultaneously, but – as a footnote in the preface to the publication points out – a choice was made: “[...] due to budget limitations, all the ‘represented’ languages could not be included. Only German, English, French, Italian, and Spanish could be considered.” (Stickel 2002:12) Although Englishmen were not represented at the conference, but there were seven German participants, three Dutch, two Danes, two Frenchmen and two Italians, one Swede and one Spaniard. How does one justify the choice of three Romance languages, instead of Dutch or one of the Scandinavian languages?

The conference publication reveals a more conscious language policy. The participants are asked to hand in a parallel text in their native language. Inge Lise Pedersen, a Danish participant, did not comply with this request and explains her decision in her contribution: “It was not possible to speak Danish or the other “small” languages at the meeting in Mannheim [...]. Therefore, you would get a false impression if you find papers in Danish (or Swedish, Finnish, Dutch and Greek) in the publication. I do not write this to blame the organizers that it was not possible to speak Danish at the meeting (there were no practical reasons for this, and if we want to co-operate, we must be pragmatic), but to point out that in the spite of all talk of linguistic multiplicity, equality between the languages represented in Mannheim was out of question.” (Pedersen 2002:81f)

This rhetoric of equality also characterizes – as Phillipson (2003) points out – the discussions about the official languages and working languages in the EU. The following stance of the “Würzburg Declaration on European Language Policy” reveals that, at the end of the day, the countries primarily take an interest in their own language (that is their own culture, education, science and economy): “To meet the aim of European plurilingualism the European Union should extend the number of its working languages. In this case German must be acknowledged as one of the working languages within the institutions of the European Parliament.”

The incoherent language policy at the Würzburg conference demonstrates that this kind of (linguistic) nationalism is rejected in practice: while the Danes and Finns conform to the declaration and use German as their working language, not only all the British, but also the French and even many Germans gave their presentations in Anglo-American.

The question is: which European languages should function as working languages? How do we justify this special status? The distinction between ‘small’ and ‘big’ languages – which Pedersen has referred to – is problematic, mainly because it contradicts the democratic principle of minority protection. Reality focuses on the question of relevance overlooked by ideology: is it relevant that Greeks give their contributions in Greek at an international conference? Pedersen stresses that a pragmatic approach is necessary. However, languages do not primarily follow pragmatic principles. Is it, in fact, possible to make a choice that will satisfy?

The conferences have the intention to live up to linguistic diversity in Europe: in their welcome⁶ and in their choice of topics. However, the implementation of multilingualism is problematic, basically for economic reasons: economy of time (at the conference) and economy of space (in

⁶ Stickel (2002:15), for example, welcomes the participants in their own language.

the conference publication). The financial situation requires a choice, yet a legitimate choice is apparently not feasible. Consequently, the predominant or obvious language is – also at the language policy conferences – the language of power.

3. Final remarks

While the conferences at their text level oppose social practice and call for social change, conference practice reproduces the social practice of contemporary Europe.⁷ The microcosm is subjected to the same market forces as the macrocosm: the language policy conferences are not exclusively held in Danish, German or Esperanto, because they attract a smaller audience than those held in Anglo-American.

The divide between theory and practice seems deep. When conferences are held on issues of linguistic diversity, that themselves only represent a minority of European languages and which are unable to subscribe to a clear language policy in their own microcosm, it makes one wonder just how the EU is to meet the challenge of multilingualism.⁸ The practice of these conferences raises the question, whether a change in social practice is possible, i.e. if the idea of European linguistic diversity is an illusion?

A little soul-searching is called for, if one is genuinely seeking to promote and facilitate the ecology of languages in Europe and stem the tide of Anglo-American self-assurance and predominance.

References

- De Cillia, Rudolf, Hans-Jürgen Krumm and Ruth Wodak 2003. Vorwort, in: R. de Cillia, H.-J. Krumm and R. Wodak eds., *Die Kosten der Mehrsprachigkeit. Globalisierung und sprachliche Vielfalt*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 7-8.
- Fairclough, Norman 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Longman.
- Haberland, Hartmut 1989. Whose English, Nobody's Business. *Journal of Pragmatics* 13:927-938.
- Muhr, Rudolf and Bernhardt Kettemann eds. 2002. *Eurospeak. Der Einfluss des Englischen auf europäische Sprachen zur Jahrtausendwende*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Oplæg fra en intern arbejdsgruppe 2003. *Sprog på spil – et udspil til en dansk sprogpolitik*. København: Kulturministeriet.
- Pedersen, Inge Lise 2002. European Standard Languages and Multilingual Europe – The Nordic Language Council, in: G. Stickel ed., *Europäische Hochsprachen und mehrsprachiges Europa*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache. 73-83.
- Phillipson, Robert 2003. *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Stickel, Gerhard 2002a. Vorwort, in: G. Stickel ed., *Europäische Hochsprachen und mehrsprachiges Europa*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache. 7-13.
- Stickel, Gerhard 2002b. Grußwort, in: G. Stickel ed., *Europäische Hochsprachen und mehrsprachiges Europa*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache. 15-24.

⁷ The terminology is based on Fairclough's (1992:73) three-dimensional conception of discourse.

⁸ De Cillia, Krumm and Wodak (2003:7) point out the tabooed paradox of the European Language Policy: "Es existiert jedoch ein deutlicher Widerspruch zwischen diesen Erklärungen und der sprachenpolitischen Praxis. [...] Die Widersprüchlichkeit europäischer Sprachenpolitik ist im öffentlichen Diskurs allerdings tabuisiert."